

SUPPLEMENTS TO  
VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE

---



# Jerome and the Monastic Clergy

A Commentary on Letter 52  
to Nepotian, with an Introduction,  
Text, and Translation



By  
ANDREW CAIN

---

BRILL

## Jerome and the Monastic Clergy

Supplements  
to  
Vigiliae Christianae

Texts and Studies of  
Early Christian Life and Language

*Editors*

J. den Boeft – B.D. Ehrman – J. van Oort  
D.T. Runia – C. Scholten – J.C.M. van Winden

VOLUME 119

# Jerome and the Monastic Clergy

A Commentary on Letter 52 to Nepotian,  
with an Introduction, Text, and Translation

*By*

Andrew Cain



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON

2013

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see [www.brill.com/brill-typeface](http://www.brill.com/brill-typeface).

ISSN 0920-623X

ISBN 978-90-04-23706-3 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-24438-2 (e-book)

Copyright 2013 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.  
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

## CONTENTS

Preface .....	VII
Abbreviations .....	IX
Introduction .....	1
References .....	25

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

Ad Nepotianum .....	32
---------------------	----

## COMMENTARY

Chapter 1 .....	60
Chapter 2 .....	76
Chapter 3 .....	84
Chapter 4 .....	108
Chapter 5 .....	120
Chapter 6 .....	156
Chapter 7 .....	172
Chapter 8 .....	189
Chapter 9 .....	204
Chapter 10 .....	212
Chapter 11 .....	223
Chapter 12 .....	234
Chapter 13 .....	240
Chapter 14 .....	249
Chapter 15 .....	253
Chapter 16 .....	259
Chapter 17 .....	267
Bibliography of Ancient Authors .....	275
Index of Names and Subjects .....	291
Index of Sources .....	296
Index of Latin Words .....	323
Index of Greek Words .....	325
Index of Hebrew and Aramaic Words .....	326



## PREFACE

This volume provides the first full-scale commentary, in any language, on what is preserved in modern editions of Jerome's correspondence as *Letter 52*, an epistolary treatise addressed to the young Italian priest Nepotian in which Jerome articulates his radical plan for imposing a strict ascetic code of conduct on the contemporary clergy. This work, presented here in a newly revised Latin edition accompanied by a facing-page English translation, is one of Jerome's most famous and (in posterity) most influential writings, yet until now it has not received the depth of scholarly analysis that only a proper commentary can afford.<sup>1</sup> In its scope this commentary seeks to comprehensively address all facets of the text—stylistic, literary, philological (Latin, Greek, Hebrew), historical, archeological, religious, theological, text-critical—which are pertinent to its elucidation, and, as such, it is hoped that scholars and students of diverse research interests and specialties will derive benefit from the explanations. Furthermore, it has been my aim to cite copious parallel passages from classical and patristic literature so as to properly situate the work and its author in their intellectual milieu.<sup>2</sup>

During the course of writing this book I have profited from intellectual exchanges with a number of scholars whom it is a delight to acknowledge: Neil Adkin, Ivor Davidson, Judy Evans Grubbs, David Hunter, Noel Lenski, Josef Lössl, Ralph Mathisen, Tom McGinn, Philip Rousseau, and Danuta Shanzer. I owe a debt of gratitude to the Loeb Classical Library Foundation and the University of Colorado Council on Research and Creative Work for funding an extended sabbatical leave which enabled me to complete the present commentary as well as one on another famous work by Jerome,

---

<sup>1</sup> By contrast with the works of other major canonical Latin authors, Jerome's have received less attention in this regard than is their due, but there are nevertheless some fine commentaries on several of his works, such as N. Adkin, *Jerome on Virginity: A Commentary on the Libellus de virginitate servanda (Letter 22)* (Cambridge, 2003); G.J.M. Bartelink, *Hieronymus, Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57). Ein Kommentar* (Leiden, 1980); P. Lardet, *L'Apologie de Jérôme contre Rufin: Un commentaire* (Leiden, 1997); J.H.D. Scourfield, *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60* (Oxford, 1993).

<sup>2</sup> Hence the commentator's task is akin to that of the epigrapher (see L. Robert, *Die Epigraphik der klassischen Welt* [Bonn, 1970], 47), who ideally should ground his or her interpretations not in a myopic consideration solely of the text at hand but rather in a consideration of this text alongside similar (and dissimilar) texts.



*Jerome's Epitaph on Paula: A Commentary on the Epitaphium Sanctae Paulae, with an Introduction, Text, and Translation* (Oxford, 2013). Finally, warm thanks are due to the editors of the *Vigiliae Christianae Supplements* series for accepting this book for publication, and I wish to thank in particular Jan den Boeft for his invaluable constructive criticisms.

## ABBREVIATIONS

AAAD	<i>Antichità altoadriatiche</i>
AAntHung	<i>Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i>
AASOR	<i>Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
AB	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
ABR	<i>American Benedictine Review</i>
AC	<i>L'Antiquité classique</i>
AClass	<i>Acta Classica: Proceedings of the Classical Association of South Africa</i>
AEHE V	<i>Annuaire de l'École pratique des hautes études, V<sup>e</sup> sec., sciences religieuses</i>
AHIg	<i>Anuario de historia de la Iglesia</i>
AJPh	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
AJSL	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages</i>
AJT	<i>Asia Journal of Theology</i>
ALGP	<i>Annali del Liceo Classico G. Garibaldi di Palermo</i>
ALMA	<i>Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi (Bulletin Du Cange)</i>
AnnNap	<i>Annali della facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Napoli</i>
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i>
AnnSE	<i>Annali di storia dell'esegesi</i>
AT	<i>Antiquité tardive</i>
AugStud	<i>Augustinian Studies</i>
BAGB	<i>Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé</i>
BALAC	<i>Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétiennes</i>
BArchCr	<i>Bollettino di archeologia cristiana</i>
BASO	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem and Baghdad</i>
BJ	<i>Bonner Jahrbücher des Rheinischen Landesmuseums in Bonn</i>
BLE	<i>Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique</i>
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BRL	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
BSAF	<i>Bulletin de la société nationale des antiquaires de France</i>
BStudLat	<i>Bollettino di studi latini</i>
ByzF	<i>Byzantinische Forschungen</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CCC	<i>Civiltà classica e cristiana</i>
CCSL	<i>Corpus Christianorum series Latina</i>
CE	<i>Chronique d'Égypte</i>
ChH	<i>Church History</i>
CIL	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
CISA	<i>Contributi dell'Istituto di Storia antica dell'Università del Sacro Cuore</i>
CivCatt	<i>Civiltà cattolica</i>
CJ	<i>Classical Journal</i>

CLA	<i>Codices Latini antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century</i> , ed. E.A. Lowe
ClAnt	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
CLE	<i>Carmina Latina epigraphica</i> , ed. F. Buecheler (2 fascicules, Leipzig, 1895–1897) = <i>Anthologia Latina</i> , eds. F. Buecheler and A. Riese
COCR	<i>Collectanea cisterciensia</i>
CPE	<i>Connaissance des pères de l'Église</i>
CPh	<i>Classical Philology</i>
CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CRAI	<i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres</i>
CrSt	<i>Cristianesimo nella storia</i>
CSEL	<i>Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
CSSH	<i>Comparative Studies in Society and History</i>
CT	<i>Les Cahiers de Tunisie</i>
CW	<i>Classical World</i>
DHGE	<i>Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques</i>
DOP	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
EMC	<i>Échos du monde classique</i>
EME	<i>Early Medieval Europe</i>
EMH	<i>Early Music History</i>
EphL	<i>Ephemerides liturgicae</i>
ES	<i>Epigraphische Studien</i>
ExpT	<i>Expository Times</i>
FZPhTh	<i>Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie</i>
G&H	<i>Gender &amp; History</i>
G&R	<i>Greece &amp; Rome</i>
GB	<i>Grazer Beiträge</i>
GCS	<i>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte</i>
GOTR	<i>Greek Orthodox Theological Review</i>
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies</i>
HLS	<i>Holy Land Studies</i>
HSCP	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
HThR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
ICS	<i>Illinois Classical Studies</i>
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
IF	<i>Indogermanische Forschungen</i>
IJNA	<i>International Journal of Nautical Archaeology</i>
JAS	<i>Journal of Archaeological Science</i>
JbAC	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JECS	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
JEH	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
JFSR	<i>Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
JJP	<i>Journal of Juristic Papyrology</i>
JLA	<i>Journal of Late Antiquity</i>
JMEMS	<i>Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies</i>

<i>JML</i>	<i>Journal of Medieval Latin</i>
<i>JPSM</i>	<i>Journal of Pain and Symptom Management</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JThS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LA</i>	<i>Liber annuus</i>
<i>LASBF</i>	<i>Liber Annuus Studii Biblici Franciscani</i>
<i>LSJ</i>	H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , rev. by H.S. Jones
<i>MBAH</i>	<i>Münsterische Beiträge zur antiken Handelsgeschichte</i>
<i>MEFRA</i>	<i>Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École française de Rome, antiquité</i>
<i>MGH AA</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores antiquissimi</i>
<i>MHE</i>	<i>Miscellanea historiae ecclesiasticae</i>
<i>MJKW</i>	<i>Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft</i>
<i>MP</i>	<i>Medieval Prosopography</i>
<i>Mus</i>	<i>Le Muséon</i>
<i>NRTh</i>	<i>Nouvelle revue théologique</i>
<i>NT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>OLD</i>	<i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i> , ed. P.G.W. Glare
<i>OOE</i>	<i>Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami</i>
<i>OrChr</i>	<i>Oriens christianus</i>
<i>PallMed</i>	<i>Palliative Medicine</i>
<i>PBSR</i>	<i>Papers of the British School at Rome</i>
<i>PCBE</i>	C. Pietri and L. Pietri (eds.), <i>Prosopographie chrétienne du bas-empire, II. Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313–604)</i>
<i>PCPS</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society</i>
<i>PEFQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly</i>
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i> , ed. J.-P. Migne
<i>PIBA</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association</i>
<i>PJb</i>	<i>Palästina-jahrbuch</i>
<i>PL</i>	J.-P. Migne (ed.), <i>Patrologia Latina</i>
<i>PLRE 1</i>	A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale, and J. Morris, <i>The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, I. AD 260–395</i>
<i>POC</i>	<i>Proche-orient chrétien</i>
<i>PopStud</i>	<i>Population Studies</i>
<i>QUUC</i>	<i>Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica</i>
<i>RACr</i>	<i>Rivista di archeologia cristiana</i>
<i>RAL</i>	<i>Rendiconti Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei</i>
<i>RAM</i>	<i>Revue d'ascétique et de mystique</i>
<i>Rbén</i>	<i>Revue bénédictine</i>
<i>Rbi</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>REA</i>	<i>Revue des études anciennes</i>
<i>REAug</i>	<i>Revue des études augustiniennes</i>

<i>RecAug</i>	<i>Recherches augustiniennes</i>
<i>RecTh</i>	<i>Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale</i>
<i>REJ</i>	<i>Revue des études juives</i>
<i>REL</i>	<i>Revue des études latines</i>
<i>RFHL</i>	<i>Revue française d'histoire du livre</i>
<i>RFIC</i>	<i>Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica</i>
<i>RHE</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
<i>RicRel</i>	<i>Ricerche religiose</i>
<i>RicSRel</i>	<i>Ricerche di storia religiosa</i>
<i>RLAC</i>	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>RMab</i>	<i>Revue Mabillon</i>
<i>RPh</i>	<i>Revue de philologie de littérature et d'histoire anciennes</i>
<i>RPL</i>	<i>Res publica litterarum</i>
<i>RSLR</i>	<i>Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa</i>
<i>RSPHTh</i>	<i>Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
<i>RThPh</i>	<i>Revue de théologie et de philosophie</i>
<i>SAWW</i>	<i>Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaft in Wien, Philos.-Hist. Klasse</i>
<i>SC</i>	<i>Sources chrétiennes</i>
<i>ScC</i>	<i>Scuola cattolica</i>
<i>SCent</i>	<i>Second Century</i>
<i>SCI</i>	<i>Scripta classica Israelica</i>
<i>ScrTh</i>	<i>Scrinium theologicum</i>
<i>SEJG</i>	<i>Sacris erudiri: jaarboek voor Godsdienstwetenschappen</i>
<i>SicGymn</i>	<i>Siculorum gymnasium</i>
<i>SO</i>	<i>Symbolae osloenses</i>
<i>StudMon</i>	<i>Studia monastica</i>
<i>StudPatr</i>	<i>Studia patristica</i>
<i>TAPhA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich
<i>Th&amp;Ph</i>	<i>Theologie und Philosophie</i>
<i>ThLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>ThS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
<i>ThZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>TLL</i>	<i>Thesaurus linguae Latinae</i>
<i>TQ</i>	<i>Theologische Quartalschrift</i>
<i>TR</i>	<i>Theological Review</i>
<i>TRE</i>	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i>
<i>TrThZ</i>	<i>Trierer theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>VChr</i>	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
<i>VetChr</i>	<i>Vetera christianorum</i>
<i>WS</i>	<i>Wiener Studien</i>
<i>ZAC</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

<i>ZDPV</i>	<i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>
<i>ZKG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>
<i>ZKTh</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</i>
<i>ZNTW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZPE</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>
<i>ZRG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte (Romanistische Abteilung)</i>



## INTRODUCTION

Jerome indisputably was one of the most prolific and versatile authors in all of Latin antiquity.<sup>1</sup> Virtually every conceivable prose genre employed by Christians in the first five centuries of the church—from the biblical commentary and the theological *dialogus* to the historical chronicle and the hagiographic *vita*—is exemplarily represented in his mammoth surviving literary corpus. But it is his correspondence for which he is arguably best known among most specialists and non-specialists alike. In many respects his letters can justifiably be regarded as “the finest of Christian antiquity.”<sup>2</sup> To be sure, in the ancient Latin prose epistolographic tradition—broadly construed to include not only Christian letter-writers (e.g. Ambrose, Augustine, Paulinus, Sidonius) but also their non-Christian counterparts (e.g. Cicero, Seneca, Pliny, Fronto, Symmachus)—Jerome is a luminary among luminaries.<sup>3</sup> The present book intensively investigates one of the most remarkable of these literary productions, a treatise cast in epistolary form<sup>4</sup> which is designated as *Epistula* 52 in modern editions of the correspondence. This work represents a major milestone in Jerome’s career as a proponent of ascetic theory and practice for the simple reason that he fully articulates therein his grand ideal of the monastic clergy. This writing also is a precious artifact of social and religious history and has great significance in the broader context of the period because it marks a serious attempt by a late fourth-century

---

<sup>1</sup> His biography has already been treated extensively in numerous scholarly venues over the years, and so no attempt is made here to duplicate familiar material. For his concise *vita*, see A. Cain, *St. Jerome, Commentary on Galatians* (Washington, 2010), 3–14. The standard English-language biography remains J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London, 1975), but see also S. Rebenich, *Jerome* (London, 2002), 3–59. In German, Rebenich’s *Hieronymus und sein Kreis: prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Stuttgart, 1992) and Alfons Fürst’s *Hieronymus: Askese und Wissenschaft in der Spätantike* (Freiburg, 2003) are indispensable treatments. See further the essays in A. Cain and J. Lössl (eds.), *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy* (Aldershot, 2009).

<sup>2</sup> Rebenich, *Jerome*, 79.

<sup>3</sup> For a recent study of the correspondence, with references to further bibliography, see A. Cain, *The Letters of Jerome: Asceticism, Biblical Exegesis, and the Construction of Christian Authority in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2009).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. H.-I. Marrou, “La technique de l’édition à l’époque patristique,” *VChr* 3 (1949): 208–224 (221–222), on “la frontière indécise qui, dans la littérature patristique, sépare lettres et traités”.



Christian author to reconcile the prevailing standards of clerical morality with the values of the emerging western monastic movement. While other contemporary patristic authors such as Gregory of Nazianzus,<sup>5</sup> Ambrose,<sup>6</sup> and John Chrysostom<sup>7</sup> theorized in varying degrees about an ascetic ethical mandate for clerical life,<sup>8</sup> none did so with as much apophthegmatic poignancy and gusto as Jerome did in the letter to Nepotian.<sup>9</sup>

*Epistula* 52 was composed in mid-393,<sup>10</sup> some six years after Jerome had begun the process of settling into his monastic establishment at Bethlehem, which he co-founded with his Roman patron Paula in 386.<sup>11</sup> He addressed it to Nepotianus (hereafter Nepotian), a young priest serving the church at Altinum, a coastal city in northeastern Italy, in the province of Venetia-Istria. In addition to being a priest Nepotian was a practicing monk, and he had requested guidance from Jerome about how best to integrate his monastic and clerical vocations. He was the nephew of Jerome's lifelong friend and literary patron Heliodorus, who had been bishop of Altinum since at least 381.<sup>12</sup> Nepotian was born into a privileged family in this same city probably in the middle or late 360s, as we may infer from the fact that he

---

<sup>5</sup> See S. Elm, "The Diagnostic Gaze: Gregory of Nazianzus' Theory of the Ideal Orthodox Priest in his Oration 6 (*De Pace*) and 2 (*Apologia de Fuga sua*)," in S. Elm, É. Rebillard, and A. Romano (eds.), *Orthodoxie, christianisme, histoire* (Rome, 2000), 83–100; A. Louth, "St. Gregory Nazianzen on Bishops and the Episcopate," in *Vescovi e pastori in epoca teodosiana* (2 vols., Rome, 1997), 2.81–85.

<sup>6</sup> See R. Gryson, *Le prêtre selon saint Ambroise* (Louvain, 1968), 295–317; D.G. Hunter, *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity* (Oxford, 2007), 219–224. See also I. Davidson, "Ambrose's *De Officiis* and the Intellectual Climate of the Late Fourth Century," *VChr* 49 (1995): 313–333; Id., *Ambrose, De officiis: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford, 2001).

<sup>7</sup> See M. Lochbrunner, *Über das Priestertum: historische und systematische Untersuchung zum Priesterbild des Johannes Chrysostomus* (Bonn, 1993).

<sup>8</sup> As noted by R. Greer, "Who Seeks for a Spring in the Mud? Reflections on the Ordained Ministry in the Fourth Century," in R.J. Neuhaus (ed.), *Theological Education and Moral Formation* (Grand Rapids, 1992), 22–55 (54), in his overview of the primary-source evidence, "the clerical ideal of the fourth century revolves primarily around the character of the priest."

<sup>9</sup> In the commentary Jerome's vision of the ascetic clergy is frequently compared and contrasted with the visions of Gregory, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and other patristic authors.

<sup>10</sup> P. Nautin, "Études de chronologie hiéronymienne (393–397)," *REAug* 20 (1974): 251–284 (251–253, 277). This dating is accepted by Rebenich, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis*, 202n382. The letter is dated to 394 by Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme*, 1.183n2, and Kelly, *Jerome*, 190n59.

<sup>11</sup> This settlement consisted of both a monastery for Jerome's monks and a convent for Paula's nuns as well as of a hostelry for Christian pilgrims, hundreds if not thousands of whom passed through Bethlehem on a yearly basis. On this joint monastic venture, see A. Cain, "Jerome's *Epitaphium Paulae*: Hagiography, Pilgrimage, and the Cult of Saint Paula," *J ECS* 18 (2010): 105–139.

<sup>12</sup> See on 1.1 *Heliodorum*.

was a child (*parvulus*) when his father died in c.373.<sup>13</sup> He was raised by his widowed mother,<sup>14</sup> and Heliodorus, who never married or had children of his own, acted as something of a surrogate father to the boy. After receiving a classical education and formal training in rhetoric, Nepotian entered the civil service, a typical career path for a male of his social standing.<sup>15</sup> Like his maternal uncle, he had strong monastic inclinations: even while he discharged his duties in the imperial bureaucracy he insisted upon wearing a rough goathair shirt underneath his tunic.<sup>16</sup> Before long, Nepotian left his secular profession to become, also like his uncle, a career churchman. He progressed quickly through the ecclesiastical *cursus honorum* until he was ordained a priest apparently in his early twenties,<sup>17</sup> a relatively young age for the average candidate to attain the presbyterate in the late fourth century.<sup>18</sup> His rapid promotion through the ranks may be attributed perhaps to a staffing shortage in the church at Altinum,<sup>19</sup> his own precocity,<sup>20</sup> or, most likely, primarily to nepotism on the part of Heliodorus, whose attentiveness to his nephew's professional advancement is evident from the fact that he was grooming him to be his eventual successor as bishop of Altinum.<sup>21</sup> At any rate, by the time Jerome dispatched *Epistula* 52 to him in 393, Nepotian was in his middle to late twenties. He is said to have cherished the writing,<sup>22</sup>

<sup>13</sup> See Jerome, *epist.* 60.9.1.

<sup>14</sup> Nothing is known about the mother except that she was widowed when Nepotian was still a very young boy (*epist.* 14.3.2, 60.9.1). She had at least one other child, a daughter, both of whom are mentioned in passing, but not by name, in the letter to Nepotian (see on 5.5 *sanctus ... fidei*).

<sup>15</sup> See on 1.1 *saeculi militia*.

<sup>16</sup> *epist.* 60.9.2.

<sup>17</sup> *epist.* 60.10.8.

<sup>18</sup> E.g. in 315 the Council of Neocaesarea (can. 4) stipulated that no one should be ordained a presbyter before the age of thirty.

<sup>19</sup> Extraordinary appointments sometimes had to be made to fill personnel gaps. For instance, Antoninus, who had grown up in Augustine's monastery at Hippo, was installed as bishop of the small agrarian community of Fussala at the tender age of twenty for this very reason (his tenure as bishop turned out to be disastrous: see Augustine, *epist.* 209.9, 20\*.4–7).

<sup>20</sup> According to Chrysostom (*sacerd.* 1.7, 2.8, 3.15, 6.12), exceptions to the rule could be made for promising clerical candidates distinguished for their holiness, oratorical ability, theological acumen, etc.

<sup>21</sup> Jerome, *epist.* 60.14.1. Heliodorus' dynastic designs were by no means out of the ordinary. There are numerous known instances from Late Antiquity of the episcopal office being kept in the family. For example, Cyril succeeded his uncle Theophilus as bishop of Alexandria in 412, and Domnus replaced his uncle John as bishop of Antioch in 441.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Jerome's graphic and probably exaggerated claim at *epist.* 60.11.2: *quo [libello] suscepto Croesi opes et Darii divitias se vicisse iactabat. illum oculis, illum sinu, illum manibus, illum ore retinebat; cumque in strato frequenter evolveret, super pectus soporati dulcis pagina decidebat.*

but nevertheless its impact on him was relatively short-lived, for less than three years later he fell ill and died. Around the middle of 396<sup>23</sup> Jerome addressed a letter of consolation to Heliodorus in which he celebrated his deceased protégé as the consummate embodiment of the precepts laid down in *Epistula* 52,<sup>24</sup> and through both of these works he ensured that Nepotian, an otherwise completely unknown civil servant-turned-priest, would achieve not only literary immortality but also status as an honorary 'saint'.<sup>25</sup>

### *Genre and Narrative Strategies*

*Epistula* 52 is an exemplary specimen of the παραινετικός epistolary genre.<sup>26</sup> According to the epistolographic handbook Ἐπιστολιμαῖοι χαρακτήρες (ch. 5) by Pseudo-Libanius (AD 300–500), “the paraenetic style is that in which we exhort someone by urging him to pursue something or avoid something” (παραινετική μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ δι’ ἧς παραινοῦμέν τινι προτρέποντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τι ὀρμήσαι ἢ καὶ ἀφέξεσθαι τινος).<sup>27</sup> In this type of letter the writer exhorts his addressee to embrace a positive model of behavior which he proposes in the form, for example, of a series of precepts (often framed as imperatives or gnomic sayings), and he also presents a negative model of behavior which the addressee is to shun.<sup>28</sup> This concurrent promotion of virtue and denigration of vice by an authority figure is one of the most recognizable components of ancient paraenetic literature.<sup>29</sup> The letter to Nepotian exhibits this defining feature of paraenesis even from its very opening period, where

<sup>23</sup> For this dating, see J.H.D. Scourfield, *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60* (Oxford, 1993), 230–232.

<sup>24</sup> The ways in which Nepotian is said to have embodied these precepts have been duly noted in the commentary; see e.g. on 5.3 *ne ... coepisti*, 5.7 *caveto ... devita*, 9.3 *sed ... est*, 15.2 *consolutores ... noverint*.

<sup>25</sup> I.e. Nepotian is commemorated with his own feast day (May 11) in the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, the first universal Christian liturgical calendar, and his inclusion is due directly to the literary activity of Jerome; see A.A.R. Bastiaensen, “Jérôme hagiographe,” in G. Philippart (ed.), *Hagiographies: histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1500* (Turnhout, 1994), 97–123 (101).

<sup>26</sup> For a classification of Jerome’s letters according to ancient rhetorical standards, see Cain, *The Letters of Jerome*, 207–219.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Isocrates’ words to Demonicus: διόπερ ἡμεῖς οὐ παράκλησιν εὐρόντες ἀλλὰ παραινέσιν γράψαντες μέλομέν σοι συμβουλεύειν, ὧν χρὴ τοὺς νεωτέρους ὀρέγεσθαι καὶ τίνων ἔργων ἀπέχεσθαι καὶ ποίοις τισὶν ἀνθρώποις ὀμιλεῖν καὶ πῶς τὸν ἑαυτῶν βίον οἰκονομεῖν (*orat.* 1.5).

<sup>28</sup> See S. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia, 1986), 94–106.

<sup>29</sup> See J. Gammie, “Paraenetic Literature: Toward the Morphology of a Secondary Genre,” *Semeia* 50 (1990): 41–77 (56).

Jerome visualizes the life dedicated to Christ as a straight path and sins as the by-ways that cause the Christian to diverge from this path. This feature is revealed throughout the body of letter by the persistent opposition he establishes between the conduct recommended to Nepotian and that of sham clergymen, such as businessmen (5.3), womanizers (5.5, 5.7), coiffed dandies (5.6), gluttons (6.3), predatory legacy-hunters (6.4–5), blowhard preachers (8.1–2), and stingy almoners (9.2).

The paraenesis proper of *Epistula* 52 is confined to chs. 5–16 and occupies a little more than two-thirds of the entire text, while the remainder of the writing is taken up with an elaborate preamble (1.1–4.4) and an apologetic post-scriptum (ch. 17). Jerome issues directives on a diverse range of topics, from manner of dress (9.1) and fasting (12.1–2) to alcohol consumption (11.3–4) and gift-receipt etiquette (16.1). Some topics receive more attention than others. For instance, Jerome is particularly concerned about Nepotian's conduct around women (5.4–8, 15.1), but in this he undoubtedly is projecting onto his young advisee his own anxieties stemming from his experience at Rome several years earlier when he had been accused of committing sexual indiscretions with his female disciples.<sup>30</sup> The lengthy catalogue of injunctions and prohibitions is interspersed with proverbs (5.3, 11.3–4 [*bis*]), quotations from secular literature (7.3, 8.3 [*bis*]; cf. 15.2), satiric vignettes (e.g. 6.3–5), a personal anecdote (8.2), and ubiquitous Scriptural citation. These periodic infusions serve simultaneously to support the various arguments at hand, to obviate monotony through *variatio*, and, in some cases, to impart a sense of internal structure through ring composition (e.g. two apophthegms enclose the section on alcohol consumption; see on 11.4 “*pinguis venter non gignit sensum tenuem*”).

The very nature of the paraenetic letter presupposes that the author—be he a friend, loved one, or mentor—invariably is morally superior to his addressee and therefore is theoretically in a position to offer meaningful guidance. Jerome is astutely conscious of this convention and enjoins Nepotian thusly: “Listen to one who is your brother with respect to clerical orders, your father with respect to his old age, who can guide you from the cradle of faith to the perfect age and can instruct the others through you while instituting rules of living appropriate for each and every stage along the way” (4.3). Jerome's appeal to his seniority culminates the elaborate preamble,<sup>31</sup> a rhetorical *tour de force* in its own right in which he justifies his right to

<sup>30</sup> See Cain, *The Letters of Jerome*, 107–109.

<sup>31</sup> It occupies slightly more than one-quarter of the entire work. Jerome acknowledges its inordinate length at 4.1 (*quorsum haec tam longo repetita principio?*).

advise Nepotian. He portrays himself as an aged holy man, an ascetic *senex sapiens*, who spent his earliest years in the foreboding desert taming his youthful lusts<sup>32</sup> and thereafter continued, down to the present day, to assiduously cultivate his ascetic piety, such that now he is able to draw from his allegedly vast store of practical experience and knowledge accumulated over the course of a lifetime and offer credible instruction to his young disciple.<sup>33</sup> Jerome's authority has an intellectual facet as well: he is a seasoned expert in biblical interpretation, as he demonstrates by his exegetical inset on the figure of Abishag the Shunammite, the virgin consort of King David who kept the elderly monarch's freezing body warm by her embraces (2.1–3.2, 3.7–4.2). Jerome allegorizes the historical Abishag as the *scientia Scripturarum* that he has embraced in his own old age, and he grounds his rather unconventional interpretation in a series of Hebrew etymologies, thereby presenting an ostensibly compelling case for the merits of his controversial exegetical methodology of the *Hebraica veritas*.<sup>34</sup> Hence, he masterfully incorporates this Abishag material into his narrative in such a way that it both showcases his exegetical prowess and bolsters his self-portraiture as a senior sage in whom Nepotian may place his unwavering confidence.

### *Jerome and the Monastic Clergy*

In the opening to *Epistula* 52 Jerome mentions a letter that he had written to Heliodorus while he “was curbing the first attacks of lustful youth with the austerity of the desert”. This missive “was full of tears and complaints

<sup>32</sup> *Dum essem adulescens immo paene puer et primos impetus lascivientis aetatis heremi duritia refrenarem ...* (1.1).

<sup>33</sup> On personal experience as a form of wisdom, cf. Athanasius, *v. Ant.* 39.1; Gregory of Nazianzus, *orat.* 16.20 ταῦτα συμφιλοσόφησον ἡμῖν, ὦ θεία καὶ ἱερὰ κεφαλὴ, καὶ πολλὴν ἐμπειρίαν τῷ μακρῷ χρόνῳ συλλεξαμένη, ἐξ ἧς σοφία γίνεται. The literary *persona* of the white-haired *senex* and veteran of desert monasticism that Jerome appropriates for himself here essentially is a rhetorical construct. Not only was he no older than his late forties and thus more than a decade away from meeting the traditional minimum age requirement to be considered a *senex* (see on 4.3 *fratrem collegio, patrem senio*), but also he never actually had lived in the desert; the experience to which he alludes is his approximately two-year stay (c.375–c.377) at a plush semi-rural villa owned by his wealthy patron Evagrius of Antioch (see on 1.1 *dum ... refrenarem*).

<sup>34</sup> On Jerome and Hebrew verity, see e.g. A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford, 1993); E. Prinzivalli, “*Sicubi dubitas, Hebraeos interroga*: Girolamo tra difesa dell’*Hebraica veritas* e polemica anti-giudaica,” *AnnSE* 14 (1997): 179–206; M. Graves, *Jerome’s Hebrew Philology: A Study Based on His Commentary on Jeremiah* (Leiden, 2007).

and laid bare the emotional state of a deserted comrade". The occasion of the letter to which he is referring is as follows. Around 374 Heliodorus was headed back home to Altinum after a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. He stopped in Antioch to visit with Jerome, with whom he had been friends since the early or middle 360s when the two were fellow students of rhetoric in Rome. Jerome had been staying with his patron Evagrius, a priest and the future bishop of Antioch,<sup>35</sup> and was forging plans to live out his monastic ideal among the famed monks of the Syrian desert. He pressured Heliodorus to accompany him, and the two debated the matter back and forth, but Heliodorus ultimately resisted Jerome's overtures and returned home. He had monastic ambitions of his own, but he also aspired to a career in the clergy (within a few years he would become bishop of his hometown), and he saw no reason why he could not pursue both goals simultaneously in Altinum. Jerome felt snubbed, and less than a year after Heliodorus' departure he wrote a letter (*epist.* 14) to his old friend remonstrating him both for abandoning the monastic mecca that he himself at the time believed the Syrian outback to be and for being naive enough to suppose that he could be both a monk *and* a clergyman. To Jerome's way of thinking, these two vocations are fundamentally incompatible with each other.<sup>36</sup> Monks by definition are solitary creatures who avoid human society, while clergymen are obligated by the public nature of their ministry to be among people.<sup>37</sup> Although Jerome concedes that clergymen make a vital contribution to the life of the church in their capacity as sacramental ministers,<sup>38</sup> he nevertheless argues that spiritual perfection, which is fostered by the deep introspection that comes only with solitude, is attainable solely by monks, and for this reason he exhorts Heliodorus to focus exclusively on cultivating his monastic spirituality and tries to dissuade him from entering the ranks of the clergy.

By the time Jerome was writing to Heliodorus' nephew some twenty years later, his perspective on this issue had radically changed, and he now found

---

<sup>35</sup> On their relations, see S. Rebenich, "Hieronymus und Evagrius von Antiochia," *StudPatr* 28 (1993): 75–80.

<sup>36</sup> Similarly, in early Egyptian desert monasticism these were mutually exclusive vocations, each of which had its own unique charisms; see H. Ashley Hall, "The Role of the Eucharist in the Lives of the Desert Fathers," *StudPatr* 39 (2006): 367–372 (367).

<sup>37</sup> See *epist.* 14.6.1–2, 8.1. This position is consistent with Jerome's attitude toward his own priesthood around this time. In c.377 he was ordained by Bishop Paulinus at Antioch, but he reluctantly agreed to take holy orders only on the condition that it would not interfere with his life as a monk (c. *Ioh.* 41).

<sup>38</sup> *epist.* 14.8.1.

himself championing the very notion of the monastic clergyman that he had formerly dismissed out of hand as an absurd self-contradiction.<sup>39</sup> The sharp distinction that he had once made between clergymen and monks is collapsed in the letter to Nepotian, and its place is taken by another, equally sharp distinction made between clergymen who are monks and those who are not.<sup>40</sup> Jerome allows for no middle ground: clergymen are either devout ascetics or opprobrious impostors. This polarity is articulated early on in the letter:

You despise gold, another loves it; you trample riches underfoot, he relentlessly hunts for them. You cherish silence, meekness, seclusion; he likes garb, shamelessness, public places, streets, and doctors' offices. What agreement can there be [between you and him] when there is such disagreement in ways of life? (5.4)

Jerome does not establish the ascetic life as the sole pre-requisite for the successful priest—e.g. theological orthodoxy and Scriptural expertise must be in the presbyterial tool-kit<sup>41</sup>—but he does nonetheless advocate it as the most fundamental and indispensable qualification. Not only that, but he extends this requirement to *all* those who have taken holy orders, from the lowest-ranking (lectors) to the highest-ranking (bishops), and thus he does not restrict his exhortation only to presbyters like Nepotian.<sup>42</sup>

Jerome says that the letter to Heliodorus was the product of his youthful infatuation with rhetorical artifice: “In that work I engaged in literary frivolity befitting my age at the time: I was still fired with zeal for the exercises and precepts of the rhetoricians and I decked out sundry parts of it with the frippery of the schools” (1.2).<sup>43</sup> In devaluing this previous work ostensibly on stylistic grounds Jerome essentially is distancing himself from the writing as a whole. In effect he also is making a tacit admission that his conceptualization of the clerical life vis-à-vis the monastic life has undergone a seismic shift in the nearly two decades that have elapsed between

---

<sup>39</sup> Earlier he had chided Heliodorus for seriously considering blending the two vocations, but now he held him up as the exemplar of this ideal (*epist.* 52.4.4).

<sup>40</sup> P. Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church in the Age of Jerome and Cassian* (Oxford, 1978), 126.

<sup>41</sup> A point emphasized also by John Chrysostom (*sacerd.* 4.4–5.3) and Augustine (*epist.* 60.1). Cf. L.W. Countryman, “The Intellectual Role of the Early Catholic Episcopate,” *CH* 48 (1979): 261–268.

<sup>42</sup> See on 1.1 *clericus*.

<sup>43</sup> He indirectly reinforces this criticism when he avows to Nepotian that he will abstain from stylistic conceits and meretricious finery (4.1).

the composition of the two letters. To what may we attribute his eventual conviction that ascetic discipline is to be demanded from not only monks but also the clergy? I propose two main factors in his personal life, both arising from his stay in Rome between 382 and 385, which prompted him to rethink and finally reformulate his original position. One was his disillusionment with what he perceived to be the moral shortcomings of many within the Roman clerical ranks—shortcomings that he relentlessly ridiculed.<sup>44</sup> His satire, he later claimed in the letter to Nepotian (17.2), had only a curative aim: in exposing the hypocrisy of sham churchmen he was hoping to bring about their conversion to a godly way of life, i.e. by shaming them into good behavior. Yet, such a caustic approach was a last resort that would never have been necessitated in the first place had the standards for admission to holy orders already been sufficiently high as to rule out morally inferior, non-ascetic candidates.

Another factor that may have even more profoundly shaped Jerome's thinking about the relationship between the monastic and clerical vocations is the changing tides of papal politics during his final year in Rome. On 11 December 384, Pope Damasus I died at the age of seventy-nine, and Jerome all of a sudden was left without a key literary patron as well as a powerful ideological ally.<sup>45</sup> Unlike his predecessor, Pope Siricius (December 384—November 399) was lukewarm toward the monastic movement and made his sentiments evident very soon after assuming office. In the first piece of official legislation of his pontificate, a decretal addressed to Bishop Himerius of Tarragona, he issued a canon regarding monks who desire to take holy orders:

We expect and desire that monks of high reputation for the soberness of their characters and the holy manner of their lives and faith should join the ranks of the clergy. Those under thirty years of age should be promoted through the

---

<sup>44</sup> See e.g. *epist.* 22.16.3, 22.28.3–6, 40.2.1. For an overview of his attacks on badly behaving clergymen, see e.g. D.S. Wiesen, *St. Jerome as a Satirist* (Ithaca, 1964), 65–112; cf. M. Marcocchi, *Motivi umani e cristiani nell'epistolario di S. Girolamo* (Milan, 1967), 27–51. His conviction that the clergy should be morally superior to the laity is shared by other patristic authors, such as Cyprian (*epist.* 38.1), Gregory of Nazianzus (*orat.* 2.14, 21.9), and Ambrose (*exp. Luc.* 7.29); cf. P.-G. Alves de Sousa, *El sacerdocio ministerial en los libros De sacerdotio de san Juan Crisostomo* (Pamplona, 1975), 143–150.

<sup>45</sup> Damasus actively promoted ascetic ideals, e.g. by praising virginity in both prose and verse (Jerome, *epist.* 22.22.3, *vir. ill.* 103). On Jerome's personal and professional relationship with the pope, see Cain, *The Letters of Jerome*, chap. 2; Id., "In Ambrosiaster's Shadow: A Critical Re-evaluation of the Last Surviving Letter-exchange between Pope Damasus and Jerome," *REAug* 51 (2005): 257–277.



lower orders, step by step, as time passes, and thus reach the distinction of the diaconate or the priesthood with the consecration of their maturer years. They should not at one bound rise to the height of the episcopate until they have served out the terms which we have just prescribed for each office.<sup>46</sup>

The thrust of Siricius' mandate is that the very same regulations governing advancement within the clerical ranks are binding on everyone. A monk's reputation for sanctity does not entitle him to take shortcuts through the ecclesiastical *cursus honorum*; at best, it enables him to pass the same preliminary moral litmus test that is applied to all clergymen anyway. What this really means is that a monastic pedigree does nothing at all to enhance a clergyman's formation and therefore it is essentially irrelevant to clerical office.<sup>47</sup>

Siricius' decretal to Himerius was enacted on 10 (or 11) February 385, some six months prior to Jerome's departure from Rome.<sup>48</sup> Jerome could not have been at all pleased by the anti-ascetic tenor that the new pope was already setting for his pontificate and, for that matter, for clerical culture at Rome and elsewhere throughout the West. His discontent with both Siricius' legislation<sup>49</sup> and its broader implications was, I argue, a major catalyst prompting him to devise a new model, which to some extent is a direct inversion of the one promulgated by Siricius. While Siricius eliminated the need for monastic profession and instead emphasized adherence to the strict procedural protocol of ecclesiastical promotion, Jerome subordinated ecclesiastical rank to monastic profession. In the letter to Nepotian he does implicitly acknowledge the hierarchical structure of the church,<sup>50</sup> but nevertheless when he chides bishops who haughtily lord it

---

<sup>46</sup> *Monachos quoque quos tamen morum gravitas et vitae ac fidei institutio sancta commendat clericorum officii aggregari et optamus et volumus; ita ut qui intra tricesimum aetatis annum sunt, in minoribus per gradus singulos, crescente tempore, promoveantur ordinibus: et sic ad diaconatus vel presbyterii insignia, maturae aetatis consecratione, perveniant. nec saltu ad episcopatus culmen ascendant, nisi in his eadem, quae singulis dignitatibus superius praefiximus, tempora fuerint custodita* (epist. 1.13.17 [PL 13:1144–1145]). The translation is taken from J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, *The See of Peter* (repr. New York, 1965), 706.

<sup>47</sup> See D.G. Hunter, "Rereading the Jovinianist Controversy: Asceticism and Clerical Authority in Late Ancient Christianity," *JMEMS* 33 (2003): 453–470 (455).

<sup>48</sup> On the scandalous circumstances surrounding his departure, see Cain, *The Letters of Jerome*, 99–128.

<sup>49</sup> Jerome's fundamental ideological differences with Siricius undoubtedly were fueled by personal animosity, on which see N. Adkin, "Pope Siricius' 'Simplicity' (Jerome, *Epist.* 127.9.3)," *VetChr* 33 (1996): 25–38.

<sup>50</sup> I.e. at 5.6 he refers to lower clergy (readers, acolytes, cantors) who assist priests on housecalls.

over their priests he minimizes the very notion of rank: "Let there be one Lord and one Temple, and also one ministry" (7.3).<sup>51</sup>

The Hieronymian monastic clergy does in fact have its own tidy *ordo*, but it is based on degree of personal holiness, not on ecclesiastical rank. Jerome accordingly characterizes Nepotian's ascetic life as a gradual progression to ever higher levels of sanctity: "Listen to one who ... can guide you from the cradle of faith to the perfect age and can instruct the others through you while instituting rules of living appropriate for each and every stage along the way (*per singulos gradus*)" (4.3). It is no coincidence that he employs the word *gradus*, which in contemporary ecclesiastical parlance was a technical term denoting a rank or position within the clerical hierarchy.<sup>52</sup> He thus conceptualizes the life of the monastic clergyman in terms reminiscent of gradual promotion through the church's *cursus honorum*.<sup>53</sup>

Jerome's blueprint for the monastic clergy not only inverts Siricius' model, but it also subverts it in a subtle but nonetheless significant way. If the clergy is reconceived as a basically monastic body in which personal holiness achieved through asceticism trumps all else, then to whom else can their formation be entrusted than to a veteran monk—especially one like Jerome whose spirituality had allegedly been tested in the crucible of the desert? Instruction of the clergy traditionally was the bishop's prerogative, but according to the Hieronymian model this important duty falls within the purview of the full-time ascetic, irregardless of what ecclesiastical office this ascetic happens to hold. Jerome implies as much when he assumes the responsibility of teaching Nepotian how to be the ideal priest, despite not being a bishop nor even a practicing priest,<sup>54</sup> while he delegates to Heliodorus the secondary task of reinforcing this teaching by the example of his virtuous life. Even though Heliodorus is portrayed as the quintessential monk-bishop (7.3),<sup>55</sup> he is not as advanced in the ascetic life as Jerome,

---

<sup>51</sup> Cf. R. Hennings, "Hieronymus zum Bischofsamt," *ZKG* 108 (1997): 1–11. See also G. Lutenberger, "The Decline of Presbyterial Collegiality and the Growth of the Individualization of the Priesthood (4th–5th Centuries)," *RTAM* 48 (1981): 14–58 (41–46).

<sup>52</sup> Gryson, *Le prêtre*, 127–128. Cf. Jerome, *epist.* 60.10.3 on Nepotian's hierarchical ascent: *per solitos gradus presbyter ordinatur*.

<sup>53</sup> Interestingly, Siricius uses the phrase *per gradus singulos* (cf. Jerome's *per singulos gradus*) in this sense in the above-cited canon.

<sup>54</sup> On his unwillingness to exercise the sacramental duties of his own priesthood, see Epiphanius *apud* Jerome, *epist.* 51.1.5.

<sup>55</sup> On this contemporary socio-religious phenomenon, see A. Sterk, *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church: The Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass., 2004). For a later elaboration on the theme of the monk-bishop, see S. Coates, "The Bishop as Pastor and Solitary: Bede and the Spiritual Authority of the Monk-Bishop," *JEH* 47 (1996): 601–619.

who touts his desert monastic pedigree at the beginning of the letter, and therefore Heliodorus—and, by implication, every other bishop who cannot claim a comparable ascetic résumé—is below him in the chain of command of the ascetic hierarchy of the church.

In *Epistula* 52 Jerome gives the most fulsome articulation of his ideal of the monastic clergy to survive from his pen. In subsequent years he continued to advocate this model, most notably in an epistolary manifesto (*epist.* 125) on the virtues of the cenobitic monastic life that he wrote in 412 for the Gallic monk Rusticus. In his letter to Jerome requesting spiritual direction Rusticus evidently had expressed his desire for church office,<sup>56</sup> and this prompted Jerome to address the relationship between the monastic and clerical vocations:

As far as I am concerned, town is a prison and the wilderness a paradise. Why do we who are defined by our solitariness long for the populousness of cities? Moses was trained in the desert for forty years so that he would be fit to lead the Jews; a shepherd of sheep became a shepherd of men. The apostles went from fishing out of Lake Gennesaret to fishing for men. At one time they had a father, a net, a boat. They left everything at once and followed the Lord, carrying their cross daily without having so much as a fishing rod in hand. I say this so that, even if the prospect of a clerical vocation tickles your fancy, you may learn what you can teach and may offer a reasonable sacrifice to Christ, lest you be a soldier before being a raw recruit or a teacher before being a student. It is not appropriate for someone of my modest position or capacity to pass judgment on everyone else and to say anything untoward about the ministers of the church. Let them have their own station and rank, and if you wish to join, the treatise for Nepotian that I published will be able to teach you how you ought to live therein.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> This may have been the same Rusticus who on 9 October 427 succeeded Hilarius as bishop of Narbonne and went on to become one of the most prominent Gallic bishops of the day; this view is espoused by e.g. H. Atsma, “Die christlichen Inschriften Galliens als Quelle für Klöster und Klosterbewohner bis zum Ende des 6. Jahrhunderts,” *Francia* 4 (1976): 10–17; M. Heinzelmann, *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien. Zur Kontinuität römischer Führungsschichten vom 4. bis zum 7. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1976), 106–108. If this identification is correct, then an important piece of epigraphic evidence throws some light on the *cursus* that the ecclesiastical-monastic career of Jerome’s addressee followed. An inscription dated to 29 November 445, in the nineteenth year of Rusticus’ episcopate, shows that he belonged to an ecclesiastical dynasty; both his father Bonosus and uncle Arator had been bishops. The inscription also places him and Venerius, the future bishop of Marseilles (c.431–c.451), as fellow priests in a monastery at Marseilles in the early 420s. The relevant portion reads: *Rusticus ep[iscopu]s Bonosi filius / ep[iscop]i Aratoris de sorore nepus / ep[iscop]i Veneri soci[us] in monasterio / conpr[es]b[iter]i eccl[esi]ae Massiliens[is]*; on this inscription, see H.-I. Marrou, “Le dossier épigraphique de l’évêque Rusticus de Narbonne,” *RACr* 3–4 (1970): 331–349.

<sup>57</sup> *Mihi oppidum carcer est et solitudo paradisus. quid desideramus urbium frequentiam,*

Citing Moses and the apostles as *exempla* to make his argument sound biblically legitimate,<sup>58</sup> Jerome affirms that advanced monastic training is absolutely essential preparation for the clerical life. Without it the clergyman is doomed to remain forever a mere novice. The logic here is reductionistic in that Jerome boils down the qualifications for the clergy to ascetic discipline and really nothing else (as was noted above, his position is more nuanced in *Epistula* 52). He explicitly states that he will not presume to meddle in the affairs of the clergy, yet he implicitly does this very thing by setting a minimum moral criterion for clerical candidacy and also by referring Rusticus to his letter to Nepotian, where he more fully develops this notion, as the normative guide for the clerical life.

### *To Altinum and Beyond*

*Epistula* 52 was never meant for the edification of Nepotian alone. Jerome in fact indicates to the young priest that his aim is to “instruct the others through you” (*in te ceteros erudiat*, 4.3). These ‘others’, who like the nominal addressee of the letter are clergymen with monastic inclinations, need not have been confined to Nepotian’s native Altinum, nor even to its immediate environs. The geographical scope of the readership envisaged by Jerome would almost certainly not have been this modest. After all, this is the same author who aggressively used his correspondence and other writings to shape the ideological landscape of the Christian world *writ large*, especially throughout the West, long after he had relocated to the Palestinian village of

---

*qui de singularitate censemur? Moyses, ut praeesset populo Iudaeorum, quadraginta annis eruditur in heremo, pastor ovium hominum factus est pastor; apostoli de piscatione lacus Genesar ad piscationem hominum transierunt. tunc habebant patrem, rete, naviculam: secuti dominum protinus omnia reliquerunt portantes cotidie crucem suam et ne virgam quidem in manu habentes. hoc dico, ut, etiam si clericatus te titillat desiderium, discas, quod possis docere, et rationabilem hostiam offeras Christo, ne miles ante quam tiro, ne prius magister sis quam discipulus. non est humilitatis meae neque mensurae iudicare de ceteris et de ministris ecclesiarum sinistram quippiam dicere. habeant illi ordinem et gradum suum, quem si tenueris, quomodo tibi in eo vivendum sit, editus ad Nepotianum liber docere te poterit (epist. 125.8.1–2).*

<sup>58</sup> On Jerome’s rhetorical usage of *exempla*, see P. Hamblenne, “L’*exemplum* formel dans l’œuvre conservé de Jérôme,” *Augustinianum* 36 (1996): 93–146; S. Rebenich, “Der heilige Hieronymus und die Geschichte—zur Funktion der Exempla in seinen Briefen,” *RQA* 87 (1992): 29–46; F. Rivas Rebaque, “Exempla bíblicos dirigidos a las mujeres en el epistolario de san Jerónimo,” *EstEcl* 84 (2009): 423–445; V. Skemp, “Learning by Example: *Exempla* in Jerome’s Translations and Revisions of Biblical Books,” *VChr* 65 (2011): 257–284.

Bethlehem in 386.<sup>59</sup> What is more, some three years after composing *Epistula* 52 Jerome described it as having immortalized, in textual form, his friendship with Nepotian,<sup>60</sup> and so he clearly thought of it in grandiose terms as a work of lasting importance.<sup>61</sup> Moreover, there is every reason to assume that Jerome harbored the ambition that his *épître-traité* would in time circulate as widely as possible, receiving maximal exposure and exerting its influence on an indefinitely broad scale,<sup>62</sup> and indeed the aforementioned passage from the letter to Rusticus confirms that he was keen to recommend *Epistula* 52 as a training manual for clergymen outside Italy. Be that as it may, in what follows I shall argue that back in 393, the most immediate intended destination for the letter, after Nepotian's Altinum of course, was Rome.

In the epilogue to *Epistula* 52 Jerome voices his anticipation that his unflattering portrayals of contemporary clerical *mores* throughout the letter will infuriate churchmen ashamed that he has exposed their faults. He cannot be referring to clergymen in Altinum. Heliodorus, whom he extols for his impeccable life and his attentive pastoral supervision of Nepotian,<sup>63</sup> would never tolerate such shenanigans in his clerical staff. The object of Jerome's satiric ridicule is rather clergymen who live in a major urban center, where they have more opportunities at their disposal to indulge their decadent tastes in the sensual trappings of high society.<sup>64</sup> Jerome in fact implicitly identifies the critics of *Epistula* 52 as the same sham *Roman* clerics who ten years earlier had worked themselves into a frenzy over his caricatures of them in his *Libellus de virginitate servanda* (*epist.* 22) to Eustochium: the satiric portrayals in both works, he duly points out, are not gratuitous digs

<sup>59</sup> See e.g. A. Cain, "Defending Hedibia and Detecting Eusebius: Jerome's Correspondence with Two Gallic Women (*Epp.* 120–121)," *Medieval Prosopography* 24 (2003): 15–34; Id., "Jerome's *Epistula* 117 on the *subintroductae*: Satire, Apology, and Ascetic Propaganda in Gaul," *Augustinianum* 49 (2009): 119–143; Id., *The Letters of Jerome*, chs. 5–6.

<sup>60</sup> *epist.* 60.11.2 *brevi libello amicitias nostras aeternae memoriae consecravi*.

<sup>61</sup> He expressed this conceit of literary permanence even more unabashedly regarding his epitaph on Paula: "I have erected a monument more everlasting than bronze which no lapse of time could destroy" (*epist.* 108.33.1). He is of course evoking Horace's poetic braggadocio; see the comments on this passage in A. Cain, *Jerome's Epitaph on Paula: A Commentary on the Epitaphium Sanctae Paulae, with an Introduction, Text, and Translation* (Oxford, 2013).

<sup>62</sup> It is possible, for instance, that Jerome hoped that his work would supplant his great nemesis Ambrose's *De officiis* as the definitive manual on pastoral duties in contemporary Christian Italy; see on 1.1 *dum ... refrenarem*.

<sup>63</sup> *Scio quidem ab avunculo tuo beato Heliodoro, qui nunc pontifex Christi est, te et didicisse quae sancta sunt et cotidie discere normamque vitae eius exemplum habere virtutum* (*epist.* 52.4.4).

<sup>64</sup> See on 6.3 *natus ... delectant*.

at sinners but a corrective measure to induce them to emend their behavior. But his satire in *Epistula* 52 serves an even more important purpose. As we saw above, he uses it to distinguish Nepotian from his non-ascetic colleagues, all of whom, irregardless of their actual individual merits, are indiscriminately grouped in the same category and branded with the common label of reprobates. Thus, Jerome leaves prospective clerical readers with only two alternatives: either embrace the ascetic lifestyle wholeheartedly and be pleasing to God, or join the ranks of those who by their worldly lifestyle disgrace their office and even belie their very claim to be Christians. Read with a Roman audience in mind, this takes shape as a veiled but nonetheless searing indictment of clerical opponents of (Hieronymian) asceticism at Rome, and, by implication, of Pope Siricius himself, who took official steps to curtail the influence of the monastic movement on the clerical establishment. I suggest that in reactionary response to the anti-ascetic climate that Siricius had been trying to foster among his clergy since the preceding decade, Jerome dispatched copies of *Epistula* 52 to Rome, where he had assiduously cultivated literary patrons such as Marcella<sup>65</sup> ever since leaving the city for good in the summer of 385, in the hope that his writing ultimately would transform clerical culture at Rome and refashion it in the image of his own vision for a uniformly monastic clergy.

Lest this seem an unrealistically lofty goal for Jerome to have entertained at that time, we must recall that it is perfectly consistent with his documented efforts to impose his ideological agenda on the Roman church from distant Bethlehem at this very juncture in his literary career. Soon after the annual navigation season had re-opened in late April or early May of 393,<sup>66</sup> Jerome received from friends in Rome a copy of a treatise by Jovinian which had been circulating there. Although a monk himself, Jovinian argued that ascetics are by no means spiritually superior to other Christians, and in the process he indirectly attacked Jerome's *Libellus de virginitate servanda*

---

<sup>65</sup> On Marcella's patronage of him, see Cain, *The Letters of Jerome*, ch. 3. In accordance with the ancient conventions of 'publication', Jerome would have sent his writing to Marcella and other literary patrons of his at Rome, and they would be charged with having additional copies made and then distributed. We know from a remark Jerome makes in a letter to his Roman friend Desiderius which he wrote within a few years of leaving Rome that Marcella and another Roman patron, Domnio, stocked their personal libraries with copies of his complete works (*epist.* 47.3.1).

<sup>66</sup> Between early November and April the Mediterranean Sea was *mare clausum* in that all far-offshore travel that was not absolutely necessary often was suspended due to volatile weather conditions. See L. Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Baltimore, 1995), 270–273; J. Rougé, "La navigation hivernale sous l'empire romain," *REA* 54 (1952): 316–325; E. de Saint-Denis, "Mare clausum," *REL* 25 (1947): 196–209.

as a prime example of how *not* to do applied ascetic theology.<sup>67</sup> Jovinian's movement took Rome by storm, attracting enthusiastic recruits from both the laity and clergy. Jerome was none too pleased to hear of this, especially (one imagines) in view of the fact that his own teachings had never enjoyed anything approximating this degree of popularity a decade earlier. Within days of receiving Jovinian's writing he began composing an acerbic rejoinder, the *Adversus Iovinianum* in two books, in which he attacked his opponent's teachings and labelled the man himself as the Christian Epicurus.<sup>68</sup> In the closing paragraph of this work he addresses the entire Roman Christian community as a whole and figures himself as a new Jonah preaching repentance to the latter-day Nineveh and admonishes Rome to revert to her pristine faith (i.e. the *ascetic* faith) before it is too late.<sup>69</sup> Implicit in this grandiose call to repentance is the suggestion that Jerome is the divinely appointed custodian of Roman Christianity: he, and he alone, has the prophetic where-withal, and indeed the mandate from God himself, to rescue the Roman church from damnable heresy. *Epistula* 52 is animated by the same spirit of reform as the *Adversus Iovinianum*, though in the former Jerome asserts his authority in Rome less melodramatically and in a less overt way (as can be expected since the ostensible addressee lived elsewhere in Italy). Moreover, the hypothesis advanced above newly situates the letter to Nepotian in a specific propagandistic context that has hitherto gone unappreciated by scholars. It also explains what is otherwise a curiosity of Hieronymian chronology—why, after ignoring Nepotian's numerous previous requests for a treatise,<sup>70</sup> Jerome finally complied and composed one right around the time that he finished *Adversus Iovinianum*.

<sup>67</sup> D.G. Hunter, "Helvidius, Jovinian, and the Virginity of Mary in Late Fourth-century Rome," *J ECS* 1 (1993): 47–71 (52–54).

<sup>68</sup> *adv. Iov.* 2.21, 36. Likewise, Ambrose, in a letter to the church at Vercelli, contemptuously refers to two former monastic associates of his, Sarmation and Barbatianus, as Epicureans because they "almost certainly [were] disciples of Jovinian" (R.A. Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity* [Cambridge, 1990], 76n52); cf. K.W. Noakes, "New Epicureans: Some Opponents of Asceticism in the Late Fourth Century," *StudPatr* 35 (2001): 121–124.

<sup>69</sup> *Sed ad te loquar, quae scriptam in fronte blasphemiam, Christi confessione delesti. urbs potens, urbs orbis domina, urbs apostoli voce laudata, interpretare vocabulum tuum. Roma aut fortitudinis nomen est apud Graecos, aut sublimitatis iuxta Hebraeos. serva quod diceris, virtus te excelsam faciat, non voluptas humilem. maledictionem quam tibi salvator in Apocalypsi comminatus est, potes effugere per poenitentiam, habens exemplum Ninivitarum* (*adv. Iov.* 2.38).

<sup>70</sup> See *epist.* 52.1.1 *petis, Nepotiane carissime, litteris transmarinis et crebro petis ut tibi brevi volumine digeram praecepta vivendi*. That Nepotian made frequent requests (*crebro petis*) indicates that Jerome was negligent about replying.

*The Late Antique and Medieval Fortuna of Epistula 52*

Despite Jerome's astral ambitions for *Epistula 52*, its immediate impact on the wider Christian world is altogether unknown.<sup>71</sup> Outside the confines of Jerome's own literary corpus<sup>72</sup> it is not mentioned, quoted, or evoked (e.g. in the form of convincing verbal or conceptual reminiscences) in contemporary Christian literature. The first piece of hard evidence for a readership dates to 442, more than twenty years after the author's death. A sententious line from the letter, *amico quippiam rapere furtum est, ecclesiam fraudare sacrilegium* (16.2), is quoted, without attribution, in Canon 4 of the Council of Vaison, where it is taken out of its original context to condemn family members of the deceased faithful who refuse to turn over to the ecclesiastical treasury legacies that their relatives had willed to the church.<sup>73</sup> That *Epistula 52* is quoted authoritatively by this church council suggests that it was read and taken seriously by at least some Gallic ecclesiastical prelates (i.e. the co-authors of the canons), and furthermore the fact that the author of the quotation is not identified by name but alluded to simply as 'one of the Fathers' implies that he does not *need* to be named because the origin of the line would have been readily recognizable to any well-read churchman.<sup>74</sup> Around the middle of the fifth century, within perhaps one or two decades of the convening of the Council of Vaison, St. Patrick studied the letter to Nepotian, presumably during the course of his preparation for the priesthood. Patrick's whereabouts—whether Gaul or Britain—when he read the letter are unknown, but the case for Gaul is slightly stronger for the simple reason that the Vaison *testimonium* enables us to securely place the writing in Gaul during this general period.<sup>75</sup>

The letter to Nepotian continued circulating in Gaul, and by the end of the century it had exercised a negligible influence, but an influence

<sup>71</sup> Jerome said that Nepotian, before he died, would eagerly show the letter to friends and acquaintances (*epist.* 60.11.2), but this remark should be read less as possible indirect evidence for a readership outside Nepotian himself than as self-gratifying bombast on Jerome's part.

<sup>72</sup> He refers to the letter twice (*comm. in Ion.*, prol. ll. 6–7, *epist.* 125.8.2).

<sup>73</sup> *Tales enim quasi egentium necatores nec credentes iudicium dei habendi sunt unius quoque patrum in hoc, quam scriptis suis inseruit, congruente sententia qua ait: amico quippiam rapere furtum est, ecclesiam fraudare sacrilegium* (CCSL 148:98).

<sup>74</sup> Jerome was very much a known quantity in fifth-century Gaul, and his works were widely dispersed. See R. Mathisen, "The Use and Misuse of Jerome in Gaul during Late Antiquity," in Cain-Lössl, *Jerome of Stridon*, 191–208.

<sup>75</sup> See A. Cain, "Patrick's *Confessio* and Jerome's *Epistula 52* to Nepotian," *JML* 20 (2010): 1–15.



nonetheless, on Julian Pomerius' *De vita contemplativa*.<sup>76</sup> We are able to confirm, on the basis of phraseological echoes, that it was read in the sixth century by Verecundus of Junca,<sup>77</sup> Caesarius of Arles,<sup>78</sup> Cassiodorus,<sup>79</sup> and Gregory the Great;<sup>80</sup> in the seventh century by Julian of Toledo,<sup>81</sup> Pseudo-Fructuosus of Braga,<sup>82</sup> and the anonymous author of the *Vita* of Desiderius of Cahors;<sup>83</sup> in the eighth century by Alcuin;<sup>84</sup> in the eleventh century by Peter Damian;<sup>85</sup> and in the twelfth century by the anonymous author of the

<sup>76</sup> See on 12.2 *sorbitiunculas delicatas*. Julian's principal patristic model for his theology of the priesthood was not Jerome but Augustine; see J.C. Plumpe, "Pomeriana," *VChr* 1 (1947): 227–239; C. Tibiletti, "La teologia della grazia in Giuliano Pomerio," *Augustinianum* 25 (1985): 489–506.

<sup>77</sup> 1.1 *rectum Christi tramitem teneat ne ad diversa vitiorum diverticula rapiatur*. Cf. Verecundus, *In cant. Deuteronomii* 21 *non videns ubi itineris recti tramitem consequatur, per omnes vias errorum vitiorumque diverticula pertrahetur*.

<sup>78</sup> Caesarius of Arles, duly citing his source, loosely quoted Jerome's line *non clamor populi sed gemitus suscitetur* (8.1) to support his point that sermons should be concerned with substance rather than style: *secundum sancti Hieronymi sanctum ac salubre consilium, quo ait: 'sacerdote,' inquit, "praedicante oportet ut magis gemitus suscitantur quam plausus"* (*serm.* 1.20).

<sup>79</sup> 5.8 *malorumque condemnatio laus bonorum sit*. Cassiodorus adapted this Hieronymian line (*exp. Rom.* 13 [PL 68:497] *damnatio malorum, laus bonorum est*) but eliminated Jerome's chiasmic structure and replaced *condemnatio* with *damnatio*, which—if we are to judge by his surviving writings—Cassiodorus preferred to *condemnatio* at a ratio of four to one.

<sup>80</sup> 13.3 *et ornamento tibi sunt et munimini*. At *reg. past.* 2.3 Gregory the Great likewise describes the virtues of the *sacerdos* using the same mixed metaphor of them being simultaneously an *ornamentum* and a *munimentum*: *unde supernae quoque vocis imperio in utroque umero sacerdos velamine superumeralis astringitur ut contra adversa ac prospera virtutum semper ornamento muniatur*.

<sup>81</sup> 3.8 *abundantissimum et ultra humanam vocem divini sermonis in senibus tonitruum commorari*. Cf. Julian in the short preface to his verse epistle to Modocus: *tua aetas gravis iam et maturato senio valida iuxta quod novimus tonitrua eloquentiae in senibus commorari* (CCSL 115:259).

<sup>82</sup> 5.5 *scio quosdam convaluisse corpore et animo aegrotare coepisse. periculose tibi ministrat cuius vultum frequenter adtendis*. This passage was evoked in the *Regula communis monastica* (17), composed c.660 and formerly attributed to Fructuosus of Braga, to augment the precept that ailing monks should be attended to not by women (not even female relatives) but only by fellow monks: *quod si aegrotans quispiam monachorum aut de longinquo aut de proprio monasterio non praesumat in monasterio puellarum iacere, ne relevatus corpore, animo incipiat aegrotare. et ut beatus Hieronimus ait, periculose tibi ministrat cuius vultum semper adtendis*.

<sup>83</sup> v. Des. Cadurc. 21 contains close adaptations of 7.1 (*disce quod doceas*), 7.4 (*recordemur semper quid apostolus Petrus praecipiat sacerdotibus*, followed by quotation of 1 Pet. 5:2–4), and much of ch. 13.

<sup>84</sup> The alliterative motto *disce quod doceas* (7.1) was adapted by Alcuin on numerous occasions in his letters (19, 31, 88, 117, 243, 270, 289) and once in his *Adversus Elipandum* (PL 101:251).

<sup>85</sup> 14.2 *sagitta in lapide numquam figitur, interdum resiliens percutit dirigentem. discat*

*Speculum virginum*,<sup>86</sup> Hugo of St. Victor,<sup>87</sup> Marbod of Rennes,<sup>88</sup> Burchard of Bellevaux,<sup>89</sup> John of Salisbury,<sup>90</sup> Philip of Harueng,<sup>91</sup> Rupert of Deutz,<sup>92</sup> and Peter Abelard.<sup>93</sup> Moreover, by the late Middle Ages the letter to Nepotian had been enshrined as a classic of its genre and was deemed essential reading for many priests in training, and its gradual acquisition of canonical status over the centuries was entirely a function of its author's popularity and widely recognized authority as a patristic icon.<sup>94</sup>

---

*detractor dum te viderit non libenter audire, non facile detrahare.* Cf. Peter Damian, v. Romuald. 15 (G. Tabacco, *Petri Damiani vita beati Romualdi* [Rome, 1957], 39) *inter reliqua autem virtutum dona ita exosum habebat detractiois vitium, quatinus mox ut quis ad detrahendum os aperiret, velut sagitta rigore lapidis percussa in dirigentem protinus redundaret*, and *epist.* 38 (MGH Briefe d. dt. Kaiserzeit, 4.1 [ed. K. Reindel], 362) *sed et nos tibi non immerito respondemus, quia sagitta in lapidem missa interdum percutit dirigentem et saepe incautus miles eodem telo, quo percutere adversarium nititur, ipse potius loetaliter vulneratur.* For another parallel, see on 3.7 *sed ... amplioem.*

<sup>86</sup> 4.2 *in similitudinem Mariae, cum cotidie generet semperque parturiat, incorrupta est.* Cf. *spec. virg.* lib. 1 ll. 761–763 *ecclesia enim, in qua virgines locum optimum sortiuntur, in similitudinem Mariae, cum cotidie generet semperque parturiat, incorrupta est* (CCCM 5:31).

<sup>87</sup> Hugh, who was profoundly influenced by Jerome on numerous fronts (see P. Rorem, *Hugh of Saint Victor* [Oxford, 2009], *passim*), quoted nearly verbatim 3.4–6 (*senectus ... fluxerit*) in his *Didascalicon* (3.14); see T. Offergeld, *Hugo von sankt Viktor, Didascalicon* (Freiburg, 1997), 260–262. For another parallel, see on 3.7 *sed ... amplioem.*

<sup>88</sup> 5.5 *periculose tibi ministrat cuius vultum frequenter adtendis.* Marbod quoted this line in a letter to Robert, abbot of Abrisel and Fontevrault to emphasize that women should not under any circumstances be present in the cloister with monks (PL 171:1482).

<sup>89</sup> 9.3 *multoque melius est e duobus imperfectis rusticitatem sanctam habere quam eloquentiam peccatricem.* Cf. *Apologia de barbīs* 3.4 *e duobus tamen imperfectis melius est inberbes esse viriles quam pleniberbes effeminatos.* For the identity of the anonymous author of this treatise as Burchard, see CCCM 62:132–140.

<sup>90</sup> E.g. *Policraticus* 7.23; for further references, see C. Webb, *Policraticus* (2 vols., Oxford, 1909).

<sup>91</sup> PL 203:886–890; see on 3.7 *sed ... amplioem.*

<sup>92</sup> CCCM 22:1112; see on 3.7 *sed ... amplioem.*

<sup>93</sup> In his *Historia calamitatum* (p. 108 Monfrin) Peter Abelard, a great admirer of Jerome (see C. Mews, “Un lecteur de Jérôme au XIIe siècle: Pierre Abélard,” in Duval, 429–444), quotes “*si adhuc*,” inquit apostolus, “*hominibus placerem, Christi servus non essem*.” *desivit placere hominibus et servus factus est Christi* (13.1) in the context of recruiting the authority of the monk of Bethlehem, with whom he self-identifies as a fellow sufferer from slander (*cuius me precipue in contumeliis detractiois heredem conspicio*).

<sup>94</sup> The canonical status that it was accorded was entirely a function of its author's popularity and authority as a patristic icon. On Jerome's medieval *Nachleben*, see e.g. E. Rice, *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance* (Baltimore, 1985).

*Literary Sources*

The letter to Nepotian is one of the most self-consciously erudite compositions in the surviving Hieronymian epistolary corpus, and it is evident that Jerome the literary exhibitionist was aiming to impress the discerning and well-educated reader. He draws from a wide array of biblical, classical,<sup>95</sup> patristic, and other miscellaneous sources that serve to both enhance the aesthetic quality of his prose and inform the letter's content.<sup>96</sup> Not surprisingly, biblical quotations, paraphrases, and allusions dominate the textual landscape.<sup>97</sup> Then there are the numerous classical literary references with which Jerome laces his prose.<sup>98</sup> Verbal reminiscences can be detected from at least eleven different Ciceronian works, including *Tusculanae disputationes*,<sup>99</sup> *Academica*,<sup>100</sup> *Orator*,<sup>101</sup> *De partitione oratoria*,<sup>102</sup> *De oratore*,<sup>103</sup> *Pro Plancio*,<sup>104</sup> the Philippics,<sup>105</sup> the Verrines,<sup>106</sup> and *De imperio Cn. Pompei*.<sup>107</sup> Above all, Jerome imports a significant amount of material from Cicero's *Cato maior de senectute* in ch. 3 and stylishly concludes ch. 8 with an extract from the now-fragmentary speech *Pro Quinto Gallio*. The only historian rep-

<sup>95</sup> For the classical literary references in *Epistula* 52, see H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome, and other Christian Writers* (Göteborg, 1958), 191–194. I have supplemented Hagendahl's incomplete inventory throughout the commentary.

<sup>96</sup> On Jerome's masterful talent for incorporating exceptionally diverse literary sources into his compositions, see e.g. A. Cain, "Jerome's Pauline Commentaries between East and West: Tradition and Innovation in the *Commentary on Galatians*," in J. Lössl and J. Watt (eds.), *Interpreting the Bible in Late Antiquity: The Alexandrian Commentary Tradition from Rome to Baghdad* (Aldershot, 2012), 91–110.

<sup>97</sup> For his incorporation of the biblical text into his correspondence, see further C. Tibiletti, "Immagini bibliche nel linguaggio figurato di S. Girolamo," in A. Ceresa-Gastaldo (ed.), *Gerolamo e la biografia letteraria* (Genoa, 1989), 63–79.

<sup>98</sup> In addition to his references from individual authors and works, Jerome refers generically to classical literature (*gentilis litteratura*) (2.1), classical comedy (*fabula palliata*) (5.7), and Atellan farce and mime (2.1).

<sup>99</sup> See on 3.5 *cum ... coepisset*.

<sup>100</sup> See on 7.1 *numquam de manibus tuis sacra lectio deponatur*.

<sup>101</sup> See on 8.1 *nolo te declamatorem esse et rabulam garrulumque* and 8.1 *verba ... hominum est*.

<sup>102</sup> See on 1.1 *rectum ... rapiatur*.

<sup>103</sup> See on 4.3 *ab incunabulis fidei* and 8.1 *nolo te declamatorem esse et rabulam garrulumque*.

<sup>104</sup> See on 8.2 8.2 *linguae volubilitate*.

<sup>105</sup> See on 1.1 *dum essem ... refrenarem*.

<sup>106</sup> See on 1.1 *plenam lacrimis querimoniis* and 3.3 *quasi ignis in lignis viridibus suffocetur*.

<sup>107</sup> See on 17.2 *qui mihi irasci voluerit, prius ipse de se quod talis sit confitetur*.

resented is Sallust, from whom an epithet for Cato has been borrowed.<sup>108</sup> Among the poets Jerome quotes four times from Virgil<sup>109</sup> and appropriates phraseology once from Plautus,<sup>110</sup> twice from Terence,<sup>111</sup> and once from Juvenal (or possibly Martial).<sup>112</sup> Furthermore, he inserts a quip by the early imperial orator Cn. Domitius Afer,<sup>113</sup> two proverbial sayings of unknown origin,<sup>114</sup> and a line likely from a lost *Vita Ciceronis*,<sup>115</sup> and he also gives an imprecise summary of a portion of the Hippocratic oath.<sup>116</sup> Patristic sources figure far less prominently into the literary texture of *Epistula* 52. The allegorical treatment of Abishag the Shunammite probably derives from Origen.<sup>117</sup> Jerome imports an expression from Tertullian,<sup>118</sup> quotes a famous saying by Cyprian<sup>119</sup> and echoes another Cyprianic statement,<sup>120</sup> he adapts two arresting formulations by Lactantius,<sup>121</sup> and he also draws inspiration for some of his phraseology from the orations of Gregory of Nazianzus.<sup>122</sup> There is reason to believe that he was inspired to a limited extent by John Chrysostom's dialogue *Περὶ ἱερωσύνης*<sup>123</sup> (composed c.390<sup>124</sup>); otherwise, it cannot be definitively proved, on the basis of either firm conceptual or verbal parallels, what contemporary patristic literature may have directly influenced or informed the composition of *Epistula* 52.<sup>125</sup>

<sup>108</sup> See on 3.6 *Romani generis disertissimus*.

<sup>109</sup> See on 1.2 *et ad instar boum pendentibus a mento palearibus*, 1.2 *frigidus obsistit circum praecordia sanguis*, 1.2 *"omnia ... fugit"*, and 5.3 *obsecro itaque te et repetens iterum iterumque monebo*.

<sup>110</sup> See on 3.6 *vetuli ... decrepiti*.

<sup>111</sup> See on 5.6 *solus cum sola secreto et absque arbitre non sedeas* and 17.2 *quos obsecro ut quiescant et desinant maledicere*.

<sup>112</sup> See on 5.4 *adtrita frons*.

<sup>113</sup> See on 7.3 *scitum ... senatorem*.

<sup>114</sup> See on 11.3 *ne audias ... propinare*, and 11.4 *"pinguis venter non gignit sensum tenuem"*.

<sup>115</sup> See on 8.3 *"Demosthenes tibi praeripuit, ne esses primus orator, tu illi, ne solus"*.

<sup>116</sup> See on 15.2 *Hippocrates ... describit*.

<sup>117</sup> See on 3.7 *ipsius ... ampliorem*.

<sup>118</sup> See on 12.2 *quasi publicum et commune ieiunium non putatur*.

<sup>119</sup> See on 4.3 *"non diserta sed fortia"*.

<sup>120</sup> See on 7.1 *numquam de manibus tuis sacra lectio deponatur*.

<sup>121</sup> See on 5.2 *nudam crucem nudus sequar*, and 7.2 *amare filiorum, timere servorum est*.

<sup>122</sup> See on 5.7 *quorum et sacerdotium proposito et propositum ornatur sacerdotio*, 14.1 *cave quoque ne aut linguam aut aures habeas prurientes*.

<sup>123</sup> See on 8.1 *sermo presbyteri scripturarum lectione conditus sit*.

<sup>124</sup> A.-M. Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome, Sur le sacerdoce* (Paris, 1980), 13. Chrysostom's work was in turn influenced significantly by Gregory of Nazianzus' *orat.* 2; see Lochbrunner, *Über das Priestertum*, 39–66.

<sup>125</sup> Cf. I. Davidson, "Pastoral Theology at the End of the Fourth Century: Ambrose and Jerome," *StudPatr* 33 (1997): 295–301. On the basis of his close synoptic comparison of the

*Text and Translation of Epistula 52*

The letter to Nepotian survives in nearly 300 manuscripts<sup>126</sup> and thus it evidently was one of the most popular and widely dispersed of Jerome's works during the Middle Ages. The *editio princeps* of Sextus Reissinger (Rome, 1468) was followed by a succession of other editions printed in the fifteenth through mid-eighteenth centuries,<sup>127</sup> culminating in the one by Domenico Vallarsi (Verona, 1734–1742).<sup>128</sup> The first edition of *Epistula* 52 to be established on modern principles of textual criticism, and the one upon which the commentary is based, is that of the Austrian philologist Isidor Hilberg. It appears in the first volume (CSEL 54:413–441) of his three-volume edition of the correspondence (CSEL 54–56), which was published between 1910 and 1918. In preparing his text of the letter Hilberg collated the following eleven MSS:

- ε Paris, Bibl. nat., Nouv.acq.lat. 446, s. vi
- G Naples, Bibl. naz. VI.D. 59, s. vi
- K Épinal, Bibl. munic. 68 (149), s. viii
- H Munich, Staatsbibl., Clm 6299, s. viii
- P Le Mans, 126, s. ix
- Σ Zurich, Zentralbibl. Rh. 41, s. ix–x
- D Vatican, Vat. lat. 355 + 356, s. x
- N Monte Cassino, 295 MM, pp. 241–251, s. x
- k Vatican, Vat.lat. 650, s. x
- Ψ Autun, Bibl. du Séminaire 17A, s. x
- B Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibl. 18 (Phillips 1675), s. xii

---

themes treated by Ambrose in his *De officiis* and by Jerome in his letter to Nepotian, Davidson hypothesizes that Jerome modelled his work to some extent on Ambrose's. However, according to the most rigorous source-critical standards the *corolla* of alleged similarities that Davidson adduces fails to demonstrate a certain genetic relationship between the two texts.

<sup>126</sup> These MSS are catalogued by Bernard Lambert in *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana manuscripta: la tradition manuscrite des œuvres de saint Jérôme* (4 vols., Steenbrugge, 1969–1972), 1B.598–607. Lambert's register, as a whole, does have glaring *lacunae* (see e.g. Ilona Opelt's review in *Gnomon* 45 [1973]: 46–50), and it was later supplemented by other smaller-scale inventories, notably that of J. Divjak and F. Römer, "Ergänzungen zur Bibliotheca Hieronymiana Manuscripta," *Scriptorium* 30 (1976): 85–113.

<sup>127</sup> For a full discussion of the first printed editions of Jerome's works, and especially his letters, see H.M. Pabel, *Herculean Labors: Erasmus and the Editing of St. Jerome's Letters in the Renaissance* (Leiden, 2008), 23–114.

<sup>128</sup> Jacques-Paul Migne reprinted Vallarsi's second edition in vol. 22 of his *Patrologia Latina*. On Vallarsi's editions, see G. Leiblinger, "Domenico Vallarsi's Hieronymus-Ausgaben: eine bibliographische Studie," *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Vereins für Bibliothekswesen* 11 (1907) 145–149; 12 (1908): 34–46, 167–171, 247–257.

With the exception of  $\epsilon$ ,  $G$ , and  $\Psi$ , all of these MSS contain the work in its entirety. Brief descriptions of  $G$ ,  $K$ , and  $H$  may be found in *CLA*, 6.781, 6.762 and 9.1265, respectively, and a detailed study of  $D$  is provided by Janet Blow in “Codex Vaticanus Latinus 355 + 356 and the Text of Jerome’s Letters in South Italy,” *Monastica* 4 (1984): 69–83.

Hilberg had promised a fourth volume of *prolegomena* to supplement to his critical edition, but the political turmoil of the First World War prevented him from delivering on this promise.<sup>129</sup> As a result, we have no explanation from him of his collation methodology and no knowledge of any *stemmata* that he devised during the course of his research.<sup>130</sup> We do know the identity of the 139 MSS that he and his collaborators at the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* consulted, but not their exact reasons for privileging some of the MSS over others (and this certainly applies to the eleven MSS on which the CSEL edition of the letter to Nepotian was based). Yet even if this information were available to us now, it would be of limited use because Hilberg and his colleagues did not have ready access to many important MSS. Needless to say, an updated critical edition of Jerome’s epistolary corpus, guided by a methodically sound analysis of the immense MS tradition, has long been one of the great *desiderata* of Hieronymian scholarship.<sup>131</sup> Until such a time that this monumental work can properly be undertaken, we must content ourselves with incremental improvements upon the existing text, and it is with this aim in mind that I have proposed the following eighteen revisions to Hilberg’s critical edition (in addition to countless changes in punctuation and orthography):

	<i>Hilberg</i>	<i>This edition</i>
Tit.	Ad Nepotianum presbyterum	Ad Nepotianum
1.2	ad instar	et ad instar
2.1	Somanitis	Sunamitis
2.2	repudiantur, in	repudiantur, et in
3.1	Somanitis	Sunamitis
3.3	viridioribus	viridibus
3.8	Somanitis	Sunamitis

<sup>129</sup> See J. Labourt, *Saint Jérôme: Lettres* (8 vols., Paris, 1949), 1.xliii–xlvi.

<sup>130</sup> This was lamented by reviewers of Hilberg’s edition, e.g. A. Vaccari in *Biblica* 1 (1920): 386–391, and A. Amatucci, “Per un edizione delle *Epistole* di S. Girolamo,” *Arcadia* 2 (1950): 87–88, in his review of the first volume (1949) of Labourt’s revised critical text and French translation of the correspondence.

<sup>131</sup> Cf. F. Nuvolone, “Notulae manuscriptae,” *FZPhTh* 26 (1979): 254: “On connaît, malheureusement, le manque de toute étude précise sur la tradition manuscrite des Lettres de Saint Jérôme et, en conséquence, aussi sur les différents ‘types’ d’Épistolaires du même”.

<i>Hilberg</i>	<i>This edition</i>
5.5 et germana	vel germana
6.1 sacerdotes idolorum, mimi	sacerdotes idolorum et mimi
6.5 speraret	sperarent
7.3 hoc episcopum	hoc esse episcopum
8.1 mysterii	mysteriorum
10.1 lacunaria	laquearia
11.3 fermento	frumento
11.4 ardeo et ardeo adulescentia	ardeo adulescentia
13.3 tutamini	munimini
15.1 officii ergo tui sit	officii ergo tui est
17.2 obsecro	obsecro ut

*Epistula* 52 has previously been translated thrice into English, by Paul Carroll,<sup>132</sup> William Fremantle,<sup>133</sup> and F.A. Wright.<sup>134</sup> For a variety of reasons which are highlighted *passim* in the commentary, these translations generally prove unreliable, and so it has seemed necessary to offer alongside the commentary a fresh translation which more faithfully captures the essence of Jerome's idiom.

---

<sup>132</sup> *The Satirical Letters of St. Jerome* (Chicago, 1958).

<sup>133</sup> *St. Jerome: Letters and Select Works* (New York, 1893).

<sup>134</sup> *Jerome, Select Letters*, Loeb Classical Library no. 262 (Cambridge, Mass., 1933).

## REFERENCES

- Adams M. Adams, *The Latinity of the Letters of Saint Ambrose* (Washington, 1927)
- Adkin N. Adkin, *Jerome on Virginité: A Commentary on the Libellus de virginitate servanda* (Letter 22) (Cambridge, 2003)
- Allen-Greenough J.B. Greenough et al. (eds.), *Allen & Greenough's New Latin Grammar* (New York, 1931)
- André J. André, *L'alimentation et la cuisine à Rome* (Paris, 1981)
- Antin P. Antin, *Recueil sur saint Jérôme* (Brussels, 1968)
- Arnheim M.T.W. Arnheim, *The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1972)
- Arns E.P. Arns, *La technique du livre d'après saint Jérôme* (Paris, 1953)
- Bartelink G.J.M. Bartelink, *Hieronymus: Liber de optimo genere interpretandi* (Epistula 57): ein Kommentar (Leiden, 1980)
- Bastiaensen A.A.R. Bastiaensen, *Observations sur le vocabulaire liturgique dans l'Itinéraire d'Égérie* (Nijmegen, 1962)
- Bauer W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Oxford, 2000)
- Bodin Y. Bodin, *Saint Jérôme et l'église* (Paris, 1966)
- Brown D. Brown, *Vir trilinguis: A Study in the Biblical Exegesis of Saint Jerome* (Kampen, 1992)
- Burgess T. Burgess, "Epideictic Literature", in *Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. 3 (Chicago, 1902), 89–261
- Burton P. Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Language* (Oxford, 2000)
- Cain 2003 A. Cain, "Defending Hedibia and Detecting Eusebius: Jerome's Correspondence with Two Gallic Women (*Epp.* 120–121)", *Medieval Prosopography* 24 (2003): 15–34
- Cain 2005a A. Cain, "In Ambrosiaster's Shadow: A Critical Re-evaluation of the Last Surviving Letter-exchange between Pope Damasus and Jerome", *REAug* 51 (2005): 257–277
- Cain 2005b A. Cain, "Miracles, Martyrs, and Arians: Gregory of Tours' Sources for his Account of the Vandal Kingdom", *VChr* 59 (2005): 412–437
- Cain 2006a A. Cain, "Vox clamantis in deserto: Rhetoric, Reproach, and the Forging of Ascetic Authority in Jerome's Letters from the Syrian Desert", *JThS* n.s. 57 (2006): 500–525
- Cain 2006b A. Cain, "Origen, Jerome, and the *senatus Pharisaeorum*", *Latomus* 65 (2006): 727–734
- Cain 2008 A. Cain, "*Liber manet*: Pliny, *Epist.* 9.27.2 and Jerome, *Epist.* 130.19.5", *CQ* n.s. 58 (2008): 708–710



- Cain 2009a A. Cain, *The Letters of Jerome: Asceticism, Biblical Exegesis, and the Construction of Christian Authority in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2009)
- Cain 2009b A. Cain, "Jerome's *Epistula* 117 on the *subintroductae*: Satire, Apology, and Ascetic Propaganda in Gaul", *Augustinianum* 49 (2009): 119–143
- Cain 2009c A. Cain, "Rethinking Jerome's Portraits of Holy Women", in Cain-Lössl, 47–57
- Cain 2009d A. Cain, "Tertullian, Cyprian, and Lactantius in Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians*", *REAug* 55 (2009): 23–51
- Cain 2010a A. Cain, *St. Jerome, Commentary on Galatians* (Washington, 2010)
- Cain 2010b A. Cain, "Three Further Echoes of Lactantius in Jerome", *Philologus* 154 (2010): 88–96
- Cain 2010c A. Cain, "Aelred of Rievaulx and Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians*", *CSQ* 45 (2010): 3–6
- Cain 2010d A. Cain, "Patrick's *Confessio* and Jerome's *Epistula* 52 to Nepotian", *JML* 20 (2010): 1–15
- Cain 2010e A. Cain, "An Unidentified Patristic Quotation in Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians* (3.6.11)", *JThS* n.s. 61 (2010): 216–225
- Cain 2010f A. Cain, "Gregory of Elvira, Lactantius, and the Reception of the *De ira Dei*", *VChr* 64 (2010): 109–114
- Cain 2011 A. Cain, "Jerome's Pauline Commentaries between East and West: Tradition and Innovation in the Commentary on Galatians", in J. Lössl and J. Watt (eds.), *Interpreting the Bible in Late Antiquity: The Alexandrian Commentary Tradition from Rome to Baghdad* (Aldershot, 2011), 91–110
- Cain 2012 A. Cain, "The Style of the Greek *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*", *REAug* 58 (2012), in press
- Cain 2013a A. Cain, *Jerome's Epitaph on Paula: A Commentary on the Epitaphium Sanctae Paulae, with an Introduction, Text, and Translation* (Oxford, 2013)
- Cain 2013b A. Cain, "Terence in Late Antiquity", in A. Augoustakis and A. Traill (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Terence* (Oxford, 2013), in press
- Cain-Lenski A. Cain and N. Lenski (eds.), *The Power of Religion* (Aldershot, 2009)
- Cain-Lössl A. Cain and J. Lössl (eds.), *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings, and Legacy* (Aldershot, 2009)
- Carroll P. Carroll, *The Satirical Letters of St. Jerome* (Los Angeles, 1956).
- Cavallera F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme: sa vie et son œuvre* (2 vols., Louvain, 1922)
- CCSL Corpus Christianorum series Latina (Turnhout, 1953–)
- CIL *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum* (Berlin, 1863–)
- CLA *Codices Latini antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century*, ed. E.A. Lowe (11 vols. and supp., Oxford, 1934–1971)

- Clark E.A. Clark, *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton, 1999)
- CLE *Carmina Latina epigraphica*, ed. F. Buecheler (2 fascicules, Leipzig, 1895–1897) = *Anthologia Latina*, eds. F. Buecheler and A. Riese (2 parts, Leipzig, 1894–1906), part 2
- Cokayne K. Cokayne, *Experiencing Old Age in Ancient Rome* (London, 2003)
- Cola S. Cola, *San Girolamo, Le lettere, I (1–52)* (rev. ed.; Rome, 1996)
- Conring B. Conring, *Hieronymus als Briefschreiber: ein Beitrag zur spätantiken Epistolographie* (Tübingen, 2003)
- Courcelle P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore* (Paris, 1948)
- Crislip A. Crislip, *From Monastery to Hospital* (Ann Arbor, 2005)
- CSEL *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna, 1866–)
- Danker F.W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (3rd ed., Chicago, 2001)
- Duval Y.-M. Duval (ed.), *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient. Actes du colloque de Chantilly (septembre 1986)* (Paris, 1988)
- Feichtinger B. Feichtinger, *Apostolae apostolorum: Frauenaskese als Befreiung und Zwang bei Hieronymus* (Frankfurt, 1995)
- Finn R. Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire: Christian Promotion and Practice, 313–450* (Oxford, 2006)
- Fischer G. Fischer, *Latin Grammar: The Details of Syntax* (New York, 1876)
- Fürst A. Fürst, *Hieronymus: Askese und Wissenschaft in der Spätantike* (Freiburg, 2003)
- Gaudemet J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'empire romain (IV<sup>e</sup>–V<sup>e</sup> siècles)* (Paris, 1958)
- Gesenius H.W.F. Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament* (London, 1898)
- Gildersleeve-Lodge B.L. Gildersleeve and G. Lodge, *Latin Grammar* (repr., Bristol, 2001)
- Gillis J.H. Gillis, *The Coordinating Particles in Saints Hilary, Jerome, Ambrose and Augustine* (Washington, 1938)
- Ginzberg L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, trans. H. Szold (4 vols., Philadelphia, 1909–1938)
- Goelzer H. Goelzer, *Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la latinité de Saint Jérôme* (Paris, 1884)
- Grodzynski D. Grodzynski, “Pauvres et indigents, vils et plébéiens: une étude terminologique sur le vocabulaire des petites gens dans le Code Théodosien”, *SDHI* 53 (1987): 140–218
- Grützmacher G. Grützmacher, *Hieronymus: eine biographische Studie* (3 vols., Berlin, 1901–1908)
- Gryson R. Gryson, *Le prêtre selon saint Ambroise* (Louvain, 1968)
- Hagendahl H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome, and other Christian Writers* (Göteborg, 1958)

- Hamblenne P. Hamblenne, "La longévité de Jérôme: Prosper avait-il raison?", *Latomus* 28 (1969): 1081–1119
- Hofmann-Szantyr J.B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, rev. by A. Szantyr (Munich, 1965)
- Hritzu J. Hritzu, *The Style of the Letters of St. Jerome* (Washington, 1939)
- Hunter D.G. Hunter, *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity* (Oxford, 2007)
- Jay P. Jay, *L'exégèse de saint Jérôme d'après son Commentaire sur Isaïe* (Paris, 1985)
- Jeanjean B. Jeanjean, *Saint Jérôme et l'hérésie* (Paris, 1999)
- Jones A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey* (2 vols., Baltimore, 1986)
- Jürgens H. Jürgens, *Pompa diaboli. Die lateinischen Kirchenväter und das antike Theater* (Stuttgart, 1972)
- Kamesar A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford, 1993)
- Kasch E. Kasch, *Das liturgische Vokabular der frühen lateinischen Mönchsregeln* (Hildesheim, 1974)
- Kelly J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London, 1975)
- Krebs-Schmalz J. Krebs and J. Schmalz, *Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache* (2 vols., Basel, 1905–1907)
- Kroon C. Kroon, *Discourse Particles in Latin: A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero, and at* (Amsterdam, 1995)
- Kühner-Stegmann R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* (2 vols., Leverkusen, 1955)
- Kunst C. Kunst, *De S. Hieronymi studiis Ciceronianis* (Vienna, 1918)
- Labourt J. Labourt, *Jérôme: Lettres* (8 vols., Paris, 1949–1963)
- Lambert B. Lambert, *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana manuscripta: la tradition manuscrite des œuvres de saint Jérôme* (4 vols., Steenbrugge, 1969–1972)
- Lampe G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1969)
- Laurence P. Laurence, *Jérôme et le nouveau modèle féminin: La conversion à la vie parfaite* (Paris, 1997)
- Lausberg H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (2 vols., Munich, 1960)
- Ledegang F. Ledegang, *Mysterium ecclesiae: Images of the Church and its Members in Origen* (Leuven, 2001)
- Lewis-Short C.T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (New York, 1884)
- López Fonseca A. López Fonseca, "San Jerónimo, lector de los cómicos latinos: cristianos y paganos", *CFC(L)* 15 (1998): 333–352
- Lorié L.T.A. Lorié, *Spiritual Terminology in the Latin Translations of the Vita Antonii, with Reference to Fourth and Fifth Century Monastic Literature* (Utrecht, 1955)
- LSJ H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. by H.S. Jones (Oxford, 1977)

- Luebeck E. Luebeck, *Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit* (Leipzig, 1872)
- McGuckin J. McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography* (Yonkers, 2001)
- Meershoek G.Q.A. Meershoek, *Le latin biblique d'après saint Jérôme* (Nijmegen, 1966)
- Minois G. Minois, *Histoire de la vieillesse en occident de l'antiquité à la renaissance* (Paris, 1987)
- Mohrmann C. Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens* (4 vols., Rome, 1958–1977)
- Neri V. Neri, *I marginali nell' occidente tardoantico* (Bari, 1998)
- O'Brien M. O'Brien, *Titles of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography to 540 AD.* (Washington, 1930)
- OLD *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P.G.W. Glare (Oxford, 1968–1982)
- Olivar A. Olivar, *La predicación cristiana antigua* (Barcelona, 1991)
- OOE *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami* (Amsterdam, 1969–)
- Orbán Á.P. Orbán, *Les dénominations du monde chez les premiers auteurs chrétiens* (Nijmegen, 1970)
- Osborne K. Osborne, *Priesthood: A History of Ordained Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church* (Mahwah, 1988)
- Otto A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig, 1890)
- Pease A.S. Pease, "Medical Allusions in the Works of St. Jerome", *HSCP* 25 (1914): 73–86
- PCBE C. Pietri and L. Pietri (eds.), *Prosopographie chrétienne du bas-empire, II. Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313–604)* (Rome, 1999 [part 1], 2000 [part 2])
- Pétre H. Pétre, *Caritas: étude sur le vocabulaire latin de la charité chrétienne* (Louvain, 1940)
- PG *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris, 1857–1866)
- Pichon R. Pichon, *Index verborum amatoriorum* (repr., Hildesheim, 1991)
- PL J.-P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologia Latina* (Paris, 1844–1864)
- PLRE 1 A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale, and J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, I. AD 260–395* (Cambridge, 1971)
- Powell J.G.F. Powell, *Cato Maior de senectute* (Cambridge, 2004)
- Rebenich S. Rebenich, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis: prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Stuttgart, 1992)
- Ruiz-Bueno D. Ruiz-Bueno, *Cartas de san Jerónimo* (Madrid, 1962), vol. 1
- Safrai Z. Safrai, *The Economy of Roman Palestine* (London, 1994)
- Scourfield J.H.D. Scourfield, *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60* (Oxford, 1993)
- Skahill B.H. Skahill, *The Syntax of the Variae of Cassiodorus* (Washington, 1934)
- TDNT *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (10 vols., Grand Rapids, 1977)
- TLL *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* (Leipzig, 1900–)

- Vogüé A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'antiquité, I–V* (Paris, 1991–1998)
- Weber R. Weber (ed.), *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem* (Stuttgart, 1983)
- Wiesen D.S. Wiesen, *St. Jerome as a Satirist* (Ithaca, 1964)

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

## AD NEPOTIANUM

1 (1) Petis, Nepotiane carissime, litteris transmarinis et crebro petis ut tibi brevi volumine digeram praecepta vivendi et qua ratione is qui saeculi militia derelicta vel monachus coeperit esse vel clericus rectum Christi tramitem teneat ne ad diversa vitiorum diverticula rapiatur. dum essem adulescens immo paene puer et primos impetus lascivientis aetatis heremi duritia refrenarem, scripsi ad avunculum tuum sanctum Heliodorum exhortatoriam epistulam plenam lacrimis querimoniisque et quae deserti sodalis monstraret affectum. (2) sed in illo opere pro aetate tunc lusimus et calentibus adhuc rhetorum studiis atque doctrinis quaedam scolastico flore depinximus. nunc iam cano capite et arata fronte et ad instar boum pendentibus a mento palearibus, frigidus obsistit circum praecordia sanguis. unde et in alio loco idem poeta canit: “omnia fert aetas, animum quoque”, et post modicum: “nunc oblita mihi tot carmina, vox quoque Moerim iam fugit”.

2 (1) quod ne de gentili tantum litteratura proferre videamur, divinorum voluminum sacramenta cognosce. David annos natus septuaginta, bellicosus quondam vir, senectute frigente non poterat calefieri. quaeritur itaque puella de universis finibus Israhel, Abisag Sunamitis, quae cum rege dormiret et senile corpus calefaceret. nonne tibi videtur, si occidentem sequaris litteram, vel figmentum esse de mimo vel Atellanarum ludicra: frigidus senex obvolvitur vestimentis et nisi complexu adolescentulae non tepescit? (2) vivebat adhuc Bersabee, supererat Abigea et reliquae uxores eius et concubinae quas scriptura commemorat: omnes quasi frigidae repudiantur, et in unius tantum grandaevus calescit amplexibus. Abraham multo David senior fuit et tamen vivente Sarra aliam non quaesivit uxorem. Isaac duplices David annos habuit et cum Rebecca iam vetula numquam refrixit. taceo de prioribus ante diluvium viris, qui post annos nongentos non dico

## TO NEPOTIAN

1 (1) My dearest Nepotian, in your letters from across the sea you ask, and you ask often, that I lay out for you in a short treatise rules of living and how one who has renounced service to the world and has set out to be both a monk and a clergyman may keep to the straight path of Christ and not be dragged off onto all the different by-ways of vice. When I was a young man, or rather almost a boy, and was curbing the first attacks of lustful youth with the austerity of the desert, I wrote a letter of admonition to your reverend uncle Heliodorus which was full of tears and complaints and which laid bare the emotional state of a deserted comrade. (2) Yet in that work I engaged in literary frivolity befitting my age at the time: I was still fired with zeal for the exercises and precepts of the rhetoricians and I decked out sundry parts of it with the frippery of the schools. Now, however, my head is snow-white, my forehead is wrinkled, an ox-like dewlap hangs from my chin, and “chilly blood encircles my heart”. Along these lines the same poet says in another passage: “Time takes away everything, even the mind”, and a little later: “Now I have forgotten all of my songs, and even my voice fails me”.

2 (1) But so as not to give the impression that I adduce material only from secular literature, consider the mysteries found in the divine books. When he was seventy years old David, who had once been a warrior, was unable to get warm due to the chill of old age. A young woman therefore was searched for in the entire territory of Israel—Abishag the Shunammite—to sleep with the king and warm his aged body. Does this not seem to you—if, that is, you follow the letter that kills—like either a made-up storyline from mime or Atellan farce: a shivering old man is covered in clothing but cannot get warm except in the arms of a young woman? (2) Bathsheba was still alive, Abigail was still around, and so were the rest of his wives and concubines who are mentioned in Scripture: they all were rejected as if they were cold, and the elderly man was warmed solely by the embraces of a single woman. Abraham was much older than David and yet he did not seek a second wife as long as Sarah was alive. Isaac was twice as old as David and he never got cold with Rebecca, even though she was rather advanced in years. I say nothing about the men who lived before the Flood: after nine hundred years their limbs had grown old, or rather had already started to decay, and yet



senilibus sed paene iam cariosis artubus nequaquam puellares quaesiere complexus. certe Moyses dux Israhelitici populi centum viginti annos habebat et Sephoram non mutavit.

3 (1) quae est igitur ista Sunamitis uxor et virgo tam fervens ut frigidum calefaceret, tam sancta ut calentem ad libidinem non provocaret? exponat sapientissimus Salomon patris sui delicias et pacificus bellatoris viri narret amplexus: “posside sapientiam, posside intellegentiam. ne obliviscaris et ne declinaveris a verbis oris mei. et ne dereliqueris eam et adprehendet te; ama illam et servabit te. (2) principium sapientiae: posside sapientiam et in omni possessione tua posside intellegentiam. circumda illam et exaltabit te; honora illam et amplexabitur te ut det capiti tuo coronam gratiarum, corona quoque deliciarum protegat te”. omnes paene virtutes corporis mutantur in senibus et increscente sola sapientia decrescunt ceterae. ieiunia, chameuniae, huc illucque discursus, peregrinorum susceptio, defensio pauperum, standi in oratione perseverantia, visitatio languentium, labor manuum unde praebeantur elemosynae, et ne sermonem longius traham, cuncta quae per corpus exercentur fracto corpore minora fiunt. (3) nec hoc dico quod in iuvenibus et adhuc solidioris aetatis, his dumtaxat qui labore et ardentissimo studio vitae quoque sanctimonia et orationis ad deum frequentia scientiam consecuti sunt, frigeat sapientia, quae in plerisque senibus aetate marcescit, sed quod adulescentia multa corporis bella sustineat et inter incentiva vitiorum et carnis titillationes quasi ignis in lignis viridibus suffocetur et suum non possit explicare fulgorem. (4) senectus vero, rursus admoneo, eorum qui adulescentiam suam honestis artibus instruxerunt et in lege domini meditati sunt die ac nocte, aetate fit doctior, usu tritior, processu temporis sapientior, et veterum studiorum dulcissimos fructus metit. (5) unde et sapiens ille Graeciae, cum expletis centum et septem annis se mori cerneret, dixisse fertur dolere quod tunc egrederetur e vita quando sapere coepisset. Plato octogesimo et uno anno scribens est mortuus. Isocrates nonaginta et novem annos in docendi scribendique labore conplevit. taceo ceteros philosophos: Pythagoram, Democritum, Xenocratem, Zenonem, Cleanthem, qui iam aetate longaeva in sapientiae studiis floruerunt. ad

they did not by any means seek the embraces of young women. To be sure, Moses, the leader of the Israelites, lived to the age of one hundred twenty, but he never found a substitute for Zipporah.

3 (1) So then, who is this Shunammite consort and virgin who is so boiling-hot that she can warm a shivering man, and so chaste that she does not incite him to lust? Let the most wise Solomon reveal his father's delights, and let the peacemaker [Solomon] explain the meaning of the warrior's embraces: "Gain wisdom, gain insight. Do not forget or turn away from the words of my mouth. Do not forsake her and she will keep hold of you; love her and she will guard you. (2) The beginning of wisdom is this: gain wisdom, and with all your acquisition gain insight. Clothe yourself with her and she will exalt you. Honor her and she will embrace you to the extent of placing on your head a crown of favor and of guarding you with a crown of delights". Nearly all of the body's capabilities diminish in the elderly, and as the rest [of these capabilities] decline, wisdom alone increases. Fasting, sleeping on the ground, moving about here and there, showing hospitality to strangers, advocating for the poor, having the endurance to stand during prayer, visiting the sick, working with one's hands to make money for almsgiving, and—so that I do not further elongate the discussion—all physical activities which become more labored due to the breakdown of the body. (3) I am not saying that wisdom, which withers away with age in a great many of the elderly, is cold in people who are young and still vigorous, or at any rate not in those who have obtained knowledge through exertion and unflagging determination, a holy way of life, and constant prayer to God. What I mean is that youth endures many bodily conflicts, and amid the allurements of vice and the titillations of the sinful nature it is stifled like a fire lit with green wood and cannot manifest its full brightness. (4) Indeed, I again remind you that old age—in the case, that is, of those who have fortified their youth with a good education and have meditated on the law of the Lord day and night—becomes more learned with age, more seasoned from experience, and wiser with the passage of time, and it reaps the most savory fruits of past pursuits. (5) Hence that wise man of Greece, when he realized at the age of one hundred seven that it was time for him to die, is said to have lamented that he was departing life now that he had begun to acquire wisdom. Plato died in his eighty-first year, with pen still in hand. Isocrates passed away at ninety-nine while he was busying himself with teaching and writing. I say nothing about the rest of the philosophers—Pythagoras, Democritus, Xenocrates, Zeno, Cleanthes—who excelled at cultivating wisdom when they were already at a very advanced age. I pass on to the

poetas venio: Homerum, Hesiodum, Simonidem, Stesichorum, qui grandes natu cygneum nescio quid et solito dulcius vicina morte cecinerunt. (6) Sophocles cum propter nimiam senectutem et rei familiaris negligentiam a filiis accusaretur amentiae, Oedipi fabulam, quam nuper scripserat, recitavit iudicibus et tantum sapientiae in aetate iam fracta specimen dedit ut severitatem tribunalium in theatri favorem verteret. nec mirum cum etiam Cato, Romani generis disertissimus, censorius iam et senex, Graecas litteras nec erubuerit nec desperaverit discere. certe Homerus refert quod de lingua Nestoris iam vetuli et paene decrepiti dulcior melle oratio fluxerit. (7) sed et ipsius Abisag nominis sacramentum sapientiam senum indicat ampliorem. interpretatur enim 'pater meus superfluum' vel 'patris mei rugitus'. verbum 'superfluum' ambiguum est et in praesenti loco virtutem sonat, quod amplior sit in senibus et redundans ac larga sapientia. in alio autem loco 'superfluum' quasi 'non necessarius' ponitur. 'sag' autem, id est 'rugitus', proprie nuncupatur cum maris fluctus resonant et ut ita dicam de pelago veniens fremitus auditur. (8) ex quo ostenditur abundantissimum et ultra humanam vocem divini sermonis in senibus tonitruum commorari. porro 'Sunamitis' in lingua nostra 'coccinea' dicitur ut significet calere sapientiam et divina lectione fervere. quod licet dominici sanguinis indicet sacramentum, tamen et fervorem ostendit sapientiae. unde et obstetrix illa in Genesi coccinum ligat in manu Phares, qui ab eo quod parietem diviserat duos ante populos separantem 'divisoris', id est 'Phares', sortitus est nomen. et Raab meretrix in typo ecclesiae resticulam mysteria sanguinis continentem ut Hiericho pereunte salvaretur adpendit. (9) et in alio loco de viris sanctis scriptura commemorat: "hi sunt Cinaei qui venerunt de calore domus Rechab". et dominus noster in evangelio: "ignem", inquit, "veni mittere in terram et quam volo ut ardeat". qui in discipulorum corde succensus cogebat eos dicere: "nonne cor nostrum erat ardens in nobis dum loqueretur in via et aperiret nobis scripturas?"

poets—Homer, Hesiod, Simonides, Stesichorus—who, though being elderly, sang a swan-like song more enchanting than [their] usual [song] as death was nigh. (6) Sophocles' sons accused him of senility under the pretext of his extreme old age and negligence about his financial affairs, but when he stood before the jury and read his recently composed play *Oedipus [at Colonus]*, he gave such convincing proof of his wisdom, despite being physically infirm from age, that he turned the sternness of the law-courts into the approving shouts of the theater. It is no wonder that even Cato, the most eloquent of the Romans, was neither ashamed nor daunted to make an intensive study of Greek literature when he was censor and an old man. Indeed, Homer relates that speech sweeter than honey flowed from Nestor's tongue when he was somewhat advanced in years and nearly incapacitated. (7) To return to my original point, the mystical meaning of the very name 'Abishag' discloses the more abundant wisdom possessed by the elderly. For it means 'my over-and-above father' or 'the bellowing of my father'. The word *superfluous* has more than one possible meaning. In the present instance it refers to excellence, because wisdom is more abundant and overflowing and plentiful in the elderly. But in another context *superfluous* means 'unnecessary'. As for *sag*, or 'bellowing', it describes the sound that waves make and (in a manner of speaking) the deep, low roaring heard coming from the sea. (8) Hence it is revealed that the thunder of divine speech, which is excessively booming and louder than any human voice, lingers in the ears of the elderly. Furthermore, 'Shunammite' in our language means 'scarlet-colored', signifying that wisdom is a source of warmth and is made hotter through the reading of Scripture. Although this color points to the mystery of the Lord's blood, it nevertheless also indicates the heat of wisdom. Thus that midwife in Genesis tied a scarlet thread onto the wrist of Perez, who received the name 'Perez', which means 'divider', because he divided the walls separating two peoples. So also the prostitute Rahab, who is a type of the church, hung [in her window] a scarlet rope, which symbolizes blood, so that she would be kept safe while Jericho was being destroyed. (9) Elsewhere Scripture refers to holy men as follows: "These are the Kenites who came from the warmth of the house of Rechab". Our Lord says in the Gospel: "I came to bring fire to the earth, and how I wish it were already ablaze!" This is the fire kindled in the disciples' hearts which compelled them to say: "Did not our hearts burn within us while he was talking with us on the road and while he was opening up the Scriptures to us?"

4 (1) quorsum haec tam longo repetita principio? ne a me quaeras pueriles declamationes, sententiarum flosculos, verborum lenocinia, et per fines capitum singulorum acuta quaedam breviterque conclusa quae plausus et clamores excitent audientum. amplexetur me modo sapientia et Abisag nostra, quae numquam senescit, in meo requiescat sinu. (2) inpolluta est virginitatisque perpetuae et in similitudinem Mariae, cum cotidie generet semperque parturiat, incorrupta est. hinc reor dixisse et apostolum “spiritu ferventes” et in evangelio dominum praedicasse quod in fine mundi, quando iuxta prophetam Zachariam stultus pastor esse coeperit, sapientia decrescente refrigescet caritas multorum. (3) audi igitur, ut beatus Cyprianus ait, “non diserta sed fortia”. audi fratrem collegio patrem senio, qui te ab incunabulis fidei usque ad perfectam ducat aetatem et per singulos gradus vivendi praecepta constituens in te ceteros erudiat. (4) scio quidem ab avunculo tuo beato Heliodoro, qui nunc pontifex Christi est, te et didicisse quae sancta sunt et cotidie discere normamque vitae eius exemplum habere virtutum. sed et nostra qualiacumque sunt suscipe et libellum hunc libello illius copulato ut cum ille te monachum erudierit, hic clericum doceat esse perfectum.

5 (1) igitur clericus, qui Christi servit ecclesiae, interpretetur primum vocabulum suum et nominis definitione praelata nitatur esse quod dicitur. si enim κληρος Graece ‘sors’ Latine appellatur, propterea vocantur clerici vel quia de sorte sunt domini vel quia dominus ipse sors, id est pars, clericorum est. qui autem vel ipse pars domini vel dominum partem habet, talem se exhibere debet ut et possideat dominum et ipse possideatur a domino. (2) qui dominum possidet et cum propheta dicit: “pars mea dominus”, nihil extra dominum habere potest, quod, si quippiam aliud habuerit praeter dominum, pars eius non erit dominus. verbi gratia, si aurum, si argentum, si possessiones, si variam suppellectilem, cum his partibus dominus pars eius fieri non dignatur. si autem ego pars domini sum et funiculus hereditatis eius nec accipio partem inter ceteras tribus sed quasi Levita et sacerdos vivo de decimis et altari serviens altaris oblatione sustentor, habens victum et

4 (1) What is the point of this discourse that has been belabored for so long since the opening [of the letter]? So that you do not expect from me puerile declamations, flowery formulations, meretricious finery, or pointed and terse finishers to individual sections which are calculated to elicit applause and shouts of approbation from the audience. Let wisdom embrace me right now, and let my Abishag, who never grows old, nestle in my bosom. (2) She is undefiled and ever-virgin, and like Mary she is perfectly pure even though she conceives daily and is always in labor. This is what I think the Apostle meant when he said “ardent in spirit”, and why the Lord proclaimed in the Gospel that at the end of the world, when (according to the prophet Zechariah) the shepherd will begin to turn foolish, wisdom will become scarce and the love of many will grow cold. (3) This being the case, listen to “words not eloquent but forceful”, as the blessed Cyprian says. Listen to one who is your brother with respect to clerical orders, your father with respect to his old age, who can guide you from the cradle of faith to the perfect age and can instruct the others through you while instituting rules of living appropriate for each and every stage along the way. (4) I know for a fact that from your uncle, the blessed Heliodorus, who presently is a bishop of Christ, you have learned and still daily learn what is holy, and that you have the pattern of his life as a model of virtue. Even still, receive my precepts for what they are worth and merge the present treatise with his so that while the latter may instruct you how to be the perfect monk, the former may teach you how to be the perfect clergyman.

5 (1) So then, since the clergyman serves the church of Christ, let him first understand the meaning of his name and then, once the definition of his title has been made manifest, let him strive to be what he is called. That is, if the Greek κλήρος means *sors* (‘lot’) in Latin, then [it follows that] they are called clergymen both because they are from the lot of the Lord and because the Lord himself is their lot, or portion. He who is both the Lord’s portion and has him as his portion has a responsibility to carry himself in such a way that he possesses the Lord and is possessed by him. (2) He who possesses the Lord and says with the prophet, “The Lord is my portion”, can have nothing besides the Lord, for if he has anything but the Lord, the Lord will not be his portion. For instance, if he has gold, silver, property, or decorative home furnishings, the Lord refuses to be his portion alongside these other portions. But if I am the Lord’s portion and his allotted share, I do not receive a portion along with the other tribes, but like a Levite and priest I live off the tithe and as one who serves the altar I am supported by the altar offering. Having food and clothing, I will be content with these, and, stripped of

vestitum his contentus ero et nudam crucem nudus sequar. (3) obsecro itaque te et repetens iterum iterumque monebo ne officium clericatus genus antiquae militiae putes, id est, ne lucra saeculi in Christi quaeras militia, ne plus habeas quam quando clericus esse coepisti et dicatur tibi: "cleri eorum non proderunt eis". mensulam tuam pauperes et peregrini et cum illis Christus conviva noverit. negotiatorem clericum et ex inope divitem et ex ignobili gloriosum quasi quandam pestem fuge. corrumpunt mores bonos confabulationes pessimae. (4) tu aurum contemnis, alius diligit; tu calcas opes, ille sectatur. tibi cordi est silentium mansuetudo secretum; illi verboritas adtrita frons fora placent et plateae ac medicorum tabernae. in tanta morum discordia quae potest esse concordia? hospitium tuum aut raro aut numquam mulierum pedes terant. omnes puellas et virgines Christi aut aequaliter ignora aut aequaliter dilige. ne sub eodem tecto mansearis; ne in praeterita castitate confidas. nec David sanctior nec Salomone potes esse sapientior. memento semper quod paradisi colonum de possessione sua mulier eiecerit. (5) aegrotanti tibi sanctus quilibet frater adsistat vel germana vel mater aut probatae quaelibet apud omnes fidei. quodsi huiusce modi non fuerint consanguinitatis castimoniaeque personae, multas anus nutrit ecclesia quae et officium praebeant et beneficium accipiant ministrando ut infirmitas quoque tua fructum habeat elemosynae. scio quosdam convaluisse corpore et animo aegrotare coepisse. periculose tibi ministrat cuius vultum frequenter adtendis. (6) si propter officium clericatus aut vidua tibi visitatur aut virgo, numquam domum solus introeas talesque habeto socios quorum contubernio non infameris. si lector, si acolythus, si psalter te sequitur, non ornentur vestibus sed moribus, nec calamistro crispent comas sed pudicitiam habitu polliceantur. solus cum sola secreto et absque arbitre non sedeas. si familiarius est aliquid loquendum, habet nutricem, maiorem domus virginem, viduam, maritatam; non est tam inhumana ut nullum praeter te habeat cui se audeat credere. (7) caveto omnes suspensiones et quidquid probabiliter fingi potest, ne fingatur, ante devita. crebra

possessions, I will follow only the cross. (3) I therefore beg you, and repeating it I will caution you again and again, not to regard the duty of clerical office as being akin to your previous service, or, to put it another way, not to seek worldly gain in your service to Christ, lest you have more than you did when you set out to be a clergyman and hear it said to you, "Their portions will not profit them". Let the poor and strangers—and Christ as a dining companion along with them—be acquainted with your modest dinner-table. Avoid like the plague a clergyman who engages in business, one who has catapulted himself from poverty to wealth, from obscurity to distinction. Bad company ruins good morals. (4) You despise gold, another loves it; you trample riches underfoot, he relentlessly hunts for them. You cherish silence, meekness, seclusion; he likes garrulity, shamelessness, public places, streets, and doctors' offices. What agreement can there be [between you and him] when there is such disagreement in ways of life? Let women's feet either rarely or never wear out the threshold of your humble abode. Either take no notice of all young women and virgins of Christ without discrimination, or love them all without discrimination. Do not stay under the same roof [with them]; do not trust yourself just because you have been chaste in the past. You can be neither holier than David nor wiser than Solomon. Always remember that his own wife caused the tiller of paradise to be expelled from his home. (5) When you are sick, let some holy brother or [your] sister or mother or some woman whose faith is approved by all, nurse you. But if you do not have at your disposal any such relatives or people with a sterling character, the church supports many elderly women who both provide a service and receive a benefit in return for their work, with the result that even your sickness can bear the fruit of almsgiving. I am aware of certain men who convalesce physically but become sick spiritually. It is dangerous for you to have a woman take care of you if you see her face too often. (6) If on account of the duty of clerical office you visit either a widow or a virgin, never go into her house alone, but choose the sorts of companions who will not cause you disgrace through your association with them. If a reader, if an acolyte, if a cantor accompanies you, let them be distinguished by their character, not their clothing, and let them not curl their hair with tongs but let them give assurance, by the way they carry themselves, that they are sexually pure. Do not sit alone with a woman behind closed doors and without a witness. If there is a need to converse on an informal level, she has her nurse, an older virgin in her household, a widow, or a married woman. She is not so anti-social that she has nobody but you in whom to confide. (7) Be on guard against everything that causes people to harbor suspicions about you. If any plausible-sounding rumor



munuscula et orariola et fasciolas et vestes ori adplicatas et degustatos cibos blandasque et dulces litterulas sanctus amor non habet. “mel meum, lumen meum meumque desiderium” et ceteras ineptias amatorum, omnes delicias et lepores et risu dignas urbanitates in comoediis erubescimus, in saeculi hominibus detestamur: quanto magis in clericis et in clericis monachis, quorum et sacerdotium proposito et propositum ornatur sacerdotio. (8) nec hoc dico quod aut in te aut in sanctis viris ista formidem sed quod in omni proposito, in omni gradu et sexu et boni et mali repperiantur malorumque condemnatio laus bonorum sit.

6 (1) pudet dicere: sacerdotes idolorum et mimi et aurigae et scorta hereditates capiunt; solis clericis et monachis hoc lege prohibetur et prohibetur non a persecutoribus, sed a principibus Christianis. nec de lege conqueror, sed doleo cur meruerimus hanc legem. cauterium bonum est sed quo mihi vulnus ut indigeam cauterio? provida severaque legis cautio et tamen nec sic refrenatur avaritia. (2) per fideicommissa legibus inludimus et, quasi maiora sint imperatorum scita quam Christi, leges timemus, evangelia contemnimus. sit heres, sed mater filiorum, id est gregis sui, ecclesia, quae illos genuit, nutrit et pavit. quid nos inserimus inter matrem et liberos? gloria episcopi est pauperum opibus providere, ignominia omnium sacerdotum est propriis studere divitiis. (3) “natus in paupere domo et in tugurio rusticano qui vix milio et cibario pane rugientem saturare ventrem poteram, nunc simulam et mella fastidio. novi et genera et nomina piscium, in quo litore concalecta sit calleo, saporibus avium discerno provincias et ciborum me raritas ac novissime damna ipsa delectant”. (4) audio praeterea in senes et anus absque liberis quorundam turpe servitium. ipsi apponunt mattulam, obsident lectum, et purulentias stomachi et phlegmata pulmonis manu propria suscipiunt. pavent ad introitum medici trementibusque labiis an commodius habeant sciscitantur. et si paululum senex vegetior fuerit periclitantur

can be started about you, defuse it before it takes shape. A chaste love knows nothing of frequent trivial presents, handkerchiefs, garters, clothes spotted with kisses, food first tasted by the giver, and tender and sentimental notes. "My honey, my darling, my heart's desire" and other absurd courtesies paid by lovers, every kind of erotic posturing, flirtatious chit-chat, and ridiculous banter—we blush at such things in comedies and we abhor them in men of the world. How much more, then, should we abhor them in clergymen and in monks who are clergymen, whose priesthood is adorned by their holy lifestyle and whose holy lifestyle is adorned by their priesthood. (8) I am not saying that I am fearful that you or upright men are guilty of such things. I am saying only that both good and bad people are found in every walk of life, in each rank and sex, and that to condemn the bad is to praise the good.

6 (1) It is shameful to say: priests who serve idols, actors, charioteers, and whores all can inherit property, and only clergymen and monks are denied this right by a law—and denied not by persecutors but by Christian emperors! I am not complaining about the law, but it pains me that we have deserved this law. A cautery is good, but how is it that I have a wound requiring a cautery? The law is provident and stern in its precautionary measures, and yet it does not succeed in restraining greed. (2) We mock the laws by setting up special trusts, and we fear the laws but treat the Gospels contemptuously, as if the emperors' decrees were more important than Christ's. Let there be an heir, but let it be the mother of the children (i.e. her flock)—the church, who gave birth to them, nourished them, and fed them. Why do we thrust ourselves between a mother and her children? It is a high honor for the bishop to provide for the needs of the poor, but it is a disgrace for all priests to concentrate on their own riches. (3) "I was born in a poor household and a peasant's shack. I used to barely be able to fill my growling belly with millet and common bread, but now I find wheat-flour and honey revolting. I know the various species of fish and their names, I am able to determine from what shore an oyster was gathered, I can tell what province a bird comes from by how it tastes, and I relish foods that are hard to find, but most of all I relish their costliness". (4) Furthermore, I have been told about certain people who shamefully enslave themselves to childless old men and women: they fetch their urine-pots, they camp out by their beds, and with their very own hands they catch gastric phlegm and sputum. They are terrified whenever the doctor arrives, and with quivering lips they inquire if [the patients] are recovering. If for a short while the old man starts to regain his strength, they become despondent but pretend to be overjoyed, and all the

ac simulata laetitia mens intrinsecus avara torquetur. (5) timent enim ne perdant ministerium et vivacem senem Mathusalae annis comparant. o quanta apud dominum merces si in praesenti pretium non sperarent! quantis sudoribus hereditas cassa expetitur! minori labore margaritum Christi emi poterat.

7 (1) divinas scripturas saepius lege, immo numquam de manibus tuis sacra lectio deponatur. disce quod doceas. obtine eum qui secundum doctrinam est fidelem sermonem ut possis exhortari in doctrina sana et contradicentes revincere. permane in his quae didicisti et credita sunt tibi, sciens a quo didiceris, paratus semper ad satisfactionem omni poscenti te rationem de ea quae in te est spe. (2) non confundant opera sermonem tuum, ne cum in ecclesia loqueris tacitus quilibet respondeat: "cur ergo haec ipse non facis?" delicatus magister est qui pleno ventre de ieiuniis disputat; accusare avaritiam et latro potest. sacerdotis Christi mens osque concordent. esto subiectus pontifici tuo et quasi animae parentem suspice. amare filiorum, timere servorum est. "et si pater sum", inquit, "ubi est honor meus? et si dominus ego sum, ubi est timor meus?" (3) plura tibi in eodem viro observanda sunt nomina: monachus, pontifex, avunculus. sed et episcopi sacerdotes se sciant esse, non dominos. honorent clericos quasi clericos ut et ipsis a clericis quasi episcopis deferatur. scitum illud est oratoris Domitii: "ego te", inquit, "habeam ut principem cum tu me non habeas ut senatorem". quod Aaron et filios eius, hoc esse episcopum et presbyteros noverimus: unus dominus, unum templum, unum sit etiam ministerium. (4) recordermur semper quid apostolus Petrus praecipiat sacerdotibus: "pascite eum qui in vobis est gregem domini providentes non coacto sed spontanee secundum deum, neque turpilucris gratia sed voluntarie, neque ut dominantes in cleris sed forma facti gregi et ex animo ut cum apparuerit princeps pastorum percipiat inmarcescibilem gloriae coronam". (5) pessimae consuetudinis est in quibusdam ecclesiis tacere presbyteros et praesentibus episcopis non loqui, quasi aut invideant aut non dignentur audire. "et si alii", inquit Paulus apostolus, "fuerit revelatum sedenti, prior taceat. potestis enim per singulos prophetare ut omnes discant et omnes consolentur. et spiritus prophetarum

while their greedy mind is inwardly tormented. (5) For they are afraid that their efforts will have been wasted and they liken the energized old man to Methusaleh. How great their reward with the Lord would be if they did not hold out hope for recompense in this life! How tirelessly they chase after an empty inheritance! The pearl of Christ could have been purchased with less effort.

7 (1) Read divine Scripture rather often, or rather, never let the sacred book leave your hands. Learn what you may teach. Gain a firm grasp of the word that is trustworthy in accordance with the teaching so that you may be able to preach sound doctrine and refute those who contradict it. Continue in what you have learned and what has been entrusted to you, knowing from whom you learned it and being always ready to make your case to anyone who demands from you an accounting for the hope that is within you. (2) Do not let your deeds belie your words, lest, when you are preaching in church, someone say to himself, “So why do *you* not behave like this?” He is a squeamish teacher who advocates the benefits of fasting when his stomach is full. Even a thief can accuse others of being greedy. Let the mind and mouth of Christ’s priest be in perfect harmony. Be obedient to your bishop and look up to him as if he were the parent of your soul. It is for sons to love, for slaves to be in fear. “If I am your father”, he says, “then where is your love for me? If I am your master, then where is your fear of me?” (3) In your case several titles for one and the same man are to be esteemed: monk, bishop, uncle. Furthermore, let bishops be aware that they are priests, not lords. Let them honor clergymen as clergymen [should be honored] so that clergymen may give them the respect due to bishops. The saying of the orator Domitius is argute: “I would have you as emperor, even though you would not have me as senator”. Let us be aware that bishops are to presbyters what Aaron was to his sons: let there be one Lord and one Temple, and also one ministry. (4) Let us always bear in mind the apostle Peter’s injunction to priests: “Feed the Lord’s flock that is among you, taking care of it, not by constraint but willingly, according to God—not for sordid gain but voluntarily; not lording it over clergymen but becoming a pattern for the flock from the heart, so that when the chief shepherd appears you may receive an imperishable crown of glory”. (5) It is a deplorable custom in some churches that presbyters remain silent and do not preach when bishops are present—as if they either envy them or do not consider it worth their while to hear what they have to say. The apostle Paul says: “If a revelation is made to one sitting, let the first be quiet. For you can all prophesy one by one so that all may learn and be encouraged. The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. For God

prophetis subiectus est; non enim est dissensionis deus sed pacis". gloria patris est filius sapiens. gaudeat episcopus iudicio suo cum tales Christo elegerit sacerdotes.

8 (1) dicente te in ecclesia non clamor populi sed gemitus suscitetur; lacrimae auditorum laudes tuae sint. sermo presbyteri scripturarum lectione conditus sit. nolo te declamatorem esse et rabulam garrulumque sed mysteriorum peritum et sacramentorum dei tui eruditissimum. verba volvere et celeritate dicendi apud inperitum vulgus admirationem sui facere indocorum hominum est. adtrita frons interpretatur saepe quod nescit et cum aliis suaserit sibi quoque usurpat scientiam. (2) praeceptor quondam meus Gregorius Nazanzenus rogatus a me ut exponeret quid sibi vellet in Luca sabbatum δευτερόπρωτον, id est 'secundoprimum', eleganter lusit: "docebo te", inquires, "super hac re in ecclesia, in qua omni mihi populo adclamante cogeris invitus scire quod nescis aut certe si solus tacueris, solus ab omnibus stultitiae condemnaberis". nihil tam facile quam vilem plebiculam et indoc-tam contionem linguae volubilitate decipere, quae quidquid non intellegit plus miratur. (3) Marcus Tullius, ad quem pulcherrimum illud elogium est: "Demosthenes tibi praeripuit ne esses primus orator, tu illi, ne solus", in oratione pro Quinto Gallio quid de favore vulgi et de inperitis contionatoribus loquatur, adtende: "his autem ludis—loquor enim quae sum ipse nuper expertus—unus quidam poeta dominatur, homo perlitteratus, cuius sunt illa convivia poetarum ac philosophorum, cum facit Euripiden et Menandrum inter se et alio loco Socraten atque Epicurum disserentes, quorum aetates non annis sed saeculis scimus fuisse disiunctas. atque his quantos plausus et clamores movet! multos enim condiscipulos habet in theatro qui simul litteras non didicerunt".

9 (1) vestes pullas aequae vita ut candidas. ornatus et sordes pari modo fugiendae quia alterum delicias, alterum gloriam redolet. non absque amictu lineo incedere, sed pretium vestium linearum non habere, laudabile est. alioquin ridiculum et plenum dedecoris referto marsuppio, quod sudarium orariumque non habeas, gloriari. (2) sunt qui pauperibus parum tribuunt ut amplius

is a God not of disorder but of peace". A wise son makes his father proud. Let the bishop rejoice in his own judgment since he has selected such men to be priests for Christ.

8 (1) When you preach in church, let not plaudits but penitential groans be elicited; let the tears of your listeners be your accolades. Let the presbyter's sermon be seasoned by his reading of Scripture. I do not want you to be a declaimer, a ranter, or a windbag, but an exceptionally well-trained expert on the mysteries and arcane things of your God's Scripture. Reeling off words and speaking briskly to win admiration from the unwashed masses are the ploys of ignorant men. The shameless man often explains what he does not know, and after convincing others he asserts for himself a possession of knowledge. (2) When I asked my former teacher, Gregory of Nazianzus, to elucidate the meaning of the phrase 'δευτερόπρωτον (or 'second-first') sabbath' in Luke's Gospel, he craftily quipped: "I will tell you in church what it means. There, as the entire congregation applauds me, either you will be forced against your will to know what you do not know, or at any rate if you alone remain quiet, you alone will be put down by everyone as a fool". There is nothing as easy as deceiving the illiterate rabble with a slick style of speaking, for whatever they do not understand they admire all the more. (3) Pay attention to what Marcus Tullius—to whom this exceptionally apt tribute was made: "Demosthenes kept you from being the foremost orator; you kept him from being the only one"—has to say about popular applause and ignorant demagogues in his speech defending Quintus Gallius: "I speak about what I myself recently witnessed. One particular poet, an intensely erudite man who has authored plays about banquets between poets and philosophers, reigns supreme at this theatrical festival when he makes Euripides converse with Menander, and Socrates with Epicurus, even though we know that their lifetimes are separated not by years but by centuries. What astounding applause and shouts of approbation he arouses with this stuff! This is because he has many fellow students who, like him, have not been schooled in literature".

9 (1) In your dress avoid dark colors as much as bright colors. Sumptuousness and slovenliness alike are to be avoided because the first smells of luxury, and the second, of pride. Walking about without a linen cloak is not praiseworthy; not having the money to buy linen clothes is praiseworthy. In any event, it is absurd and reproachful to boast that you do not have a face-cloth and handkerchief when your money-bag is bursting at the seams. (2) There are those who give a paltry amount to the poor so that they may receive

accipiant et sub praetextu elemosynae quaerunt divitias: quae magis venatio appellanda est quam elemosyna. sic bestiae, sic aves, sic capiuntur et pisces: modica in hamo esca ponitur ut matronarum in eo sacculi protrahantur. scit episcopus, cui commissa est ecclesia, quem dispensationi pauperum curaeque praeficiat. melius est non habere quod tribuam quam impudenter petere. (3) sed et genus adrogantiae est clementiorem te videri velle quam pontifex Christi est. non omnia possumus omnes. alius in ecclesia oculus est, alius lingua, alius manus, alius pes, alius auris, venter et cetera. lege Pauli ad Corinthios: “diversa membra unum corpus efficiunt”. nec rusticus et tantum simplex frater ideo se sanctum putet si nihil noverit, nec peritus et eloquens in lingua aestimet sanctitatem. multoque melius est e duobus imperfectis rusticitatem sanctam habere quam eloquentiam peccatricem.

10 (1) multi aedificant parietes et columnas ecclesiae subtrahunt. marmora nitent, auro splendent laquearia, gemmis altare distinguitur et ministrorum Christi nulla electio est. neque vero mihi aliquis opponat dives in Iudaea templum, mensam, lucernas, turibula, patellas, scyphos, mortariola et cetera ex auro fabre facta. (2) tunc haec probabantur a domino quando sacerdotes hostias immolabant et sanguis pecudum erat redemptio peccatorum, quamquam haec omnia praecesserint in figura, scripta sunt autem propter nos, in quos fines saeculorum decurrerunt. nunc vero cum paupertatem domus suae pauper dominus dedicarit, cogitemus crucem et divitias lutum putabimus. quid miramur quod Christus vocat iniquum mammonam? quid suspicimus et amamus quod Petrus se non habere testatur? (3) alioquin si tantum litteram sequimur et in auro atque divitiis simplex nos delectat historia, cum auro observemus et cetera: ducant pontifices Christi uxores virgines; quamvis bonae mentis sit qui cicatricem habuerit et deformis est privetur sacerdotio; lepra corporis animae vitiis praefertur; crescamus et multiplicemur et repleamus terram; nec immolemus agnum nec mysticum pascha celebremus quia haec absque templo fieri lege prohibentur; figamus septimo mense tabernaculum et sollemne ieiunium bucina concrepemus. quodsi haec omnia spiritualibus spiritalia comparantes scientesque cum Paulo quod lex spiritalis est et David verba cantantes: “revela oculos meos et considerabo mirabilia de lege tua”, sic intellegamus ut

a larger sum, and under the pretext of almsgiving they seek riches—this ought to be called hunting rather than almsgiving. In this way are captured beasts, fowl, and fish: a little piece of bait is put on a hook to reel in ladies' purses. The bishop, to whose care the church has been entrusted, knows whom to appoint to the task of overseeing the distribution of [alms] to the poor. It is better for me to have nothing to give than to solicit donations in a shameful way. (3) What is more, wanting to appear more generous than a bishop of Christ is a kind of arrogance. We cannot all do all things. In the church one person is an eye, another a tongue, another a hand, another a foot, another an ear, another a stomach, and so on. Read Paul's epistle to the Corinthians: "Many members make up one body". Let not an uncultured and simple-minded brother think that he is holy if he knows nothing, and let not a highly educated and articulate brother measure his holiness by his eloquence. Of these two unideal things, it is far better to have holy rusticity than sinful eloquence.

10 (1) Many build walls and remove columns from the church. The marble sparkles, panelled ceilings glisten with gold, the altar is decked out in jewels, and yet no attention is paid to choosing Christ's ministers. Now, let no one object to my point by citing the sumptuous Temple in Judea, its table, lamps, censers, dishes, cups, spoons, and the rest of the utensils made of gold. (2) These were sanctioned by the Lord at a time when priests offered sacrificial victims and the blood of sheep provided redemption from sin, though they all foreshadowed future things; they were written down to instruct us, upon whom the ends of the ages have come. But now, since the Lord founded his indigent house on the principle of his own indigence, let us reflect on the Cross and we will regard riches as dirt. Why are we in awe of what Christ calls the mammon of unrighteousness? Why do we admire and cherish what Peter proclaims himself not to possess? (3) Moreover, if we follow only the letter and find satisfaction in the one-dimensional literal sense with respect to gold and riches, then let us apply the same principle to everything else. Let Christ's bishops marry virgins. If he has a scar or some disfigurement, let him be deprived of his priesthood, even if he is of sound mind. Let bodily leprosy be preferred to spiritual faults. Let us increase and multiply and fill the earth. Let us not sacrifice a lamb or celebrate the mystical Passover because the Law forbids these things from being done without the Temple. Let us pitch a tent in the seventh month and announce a ceremonial fast with a trumpet. But if all these things are spiritual and we compare them to spiritual things, and if, like Paul, we know that the Law is spiritual and chant the words of David: "Open my eyes and I will reflect upon the wonders of your law",



dominus quoque noster intellexit et interpretatus est sabbatum, aut aurum repudiemus cum ceteris superstitionibus Iudaeorum aut, si aurum placet, placeant et Iudaei, quos cum auro aut probare nobis necesse est aut dammare.

11 (1) convivia tibi vitanda sunt saecularium et maxime eorum qui honoribus tument. turpe est ante fores sacerdotis domini crucifixi et pauperis et qui cibo quoque vescebatur alieno lictores consulum et milites excubare iudicemque provinciae melius apud te prandere quam in palatio. (2) quodsi obtenderis facere te haec ut roges pro miseris atque subiectis, iudex saeculi plus defert clerico continenti quam diviti et magis sanctitatem tuam veneratur quam opes; aut si talis est qui non audiat clericos nisi inter fialas, libenter carebo huiusce modi beneficio et Christum rogabo pro iudice, qui magis subvenire potest. melius est enim confidere in domino quam confidere in homine, melius est sperare in domino quam sperare in principibus. (3) numquam vinum redolet ne audias illud philosophi: "hoc non est osculum porrigere sed propinare". vinolentos sacerdotes et apostolus damnat et vetus lex prohibet. qui altari serviunt vinum et siceram non bibant. sicera Hebraeo sermone omnis potio nuncupatur quae inebriare potest, sive illa frumento conficitur sive pomorum suco aut favi decoquuntur in dulcem et barbaram potionem aut palmarum fructus exprimuntur in liquorem coctisque frugibus aqua pinguior colatur. quidquid inebriat et statum mentis evertit fuge similiter ut vinum. (4) nec hoc dico quod dei a nobis creatura damnetur, siquidem et dominus vini potator appellatur et Timotheo dolenti stomachum modica vini sorbitio relaxata est, sed modum et aetatis et valetudinis et corporum qualitates exigimus in potando. quodsi absque vino ardeo adulescentia et inflammor calore sanguinis et succulento validoque sum corpore, libenter carebo poculo in quo suspicio veneni est. pulchre dicitur apud Graecos, sed nescio utrum apud nos aeque resonet: "pinguis venter non gignit sensum tenuem".

12 (1) tantum tibi ieiuniorum inpone quantum ferre potes. sint pura, casta, simplicia, moderata, non superstitiosa ieiunia. quid prodest oleo non vesci et molestias quasdam difficultatesque ciborum quaerere: caricae, piper, nuces, palmarum fructus, simila, mel, pistatia? tota hortorum cultura

and if we understand them in the same way that the Lord understood and explained the sabbath, then let us either do away with gold along with the rest of the Jews' superstitions or, if we approve of gold, then let us approve also of the Jews, whom we must either accept or reject along with gold.

11 (1) You must avoid dinner parties thrown by non-Christians, especially those who revel worldly distinctions. It is shameful for consuls' lictors and soldiers to stand guard before the doors of a priest of the crucified Lord who was indigent and ate others' food, and also for a judge to have a more sumptuous lunch at your home than at his palace. (2) But in case you allege that you do this for the sake of seeking help for the dejected and the oppressed, a secular judge has more respect for a chaste clergyman than a rich one and marvels more at holiness than your wealth. Or if he is the kind of judge not to give a hearing to clergymen except over the wine-bowl, I will readily forego favors from him and will seek aid from Christ, who in his capacity as Judge is able to be of greater assistance. For it is better to trust in the Lord than to trust in man; it is better to put one's hope in the Lord than to put one's hope in magistrates. (3) Never smell of wine, lest the philosopher's saying be applied to you: "This is not offering a kiss but making a toast". Both the Apostle and the old Law prohibit priests from being drunkards. Let those who serve the altar not drink wine and *sicera*. In Hebrew *sicera* means any beverage which is able to intoxicate, whether it is made from grain or fruit juices, or from honeycomb boiled down into a crude, sweet drink, or from the juice of pressed dates, or from the thick syrup strained from a decoction of corn. Whatever intoxicates and upsets the equilibrium of the mind, avoid as you do wine. (4) I do not mean that we condemn something that God has made. After all, the Lord is called a wine-bibber and Timothy is permitted to have a modicum of wine on account of his ailing stomach. I mean rather that in the matter of drinking we establish strictures based upon age, health, and physical constitution. If I do not drink wine and yet I am on fire with youthful passion and am burning up from the heat of my blood and my body is fit and full of life, I will readily forego the wine-cup, which carries within itself the suspicion of poison. There is a splendid saying among the Greeks, but I am unsure whether it sounds just as splendid in Latin: "A fat belly does not produce to a supple mind".

12 (1) Impose upon yourself only as much fasting as you are able to bear. Let your fasts be pure, holy, unpretentious, moderate, and free from superstition. What good is it not to consume oil but yet to hunt down foods which are rare and hard to procure: figs, pepper, nuts, dates, wheat-flour, honey, and

vexatur ut cibario non vescamur pane. (2) audio praeterea quosdam contrarum hominumque naturam aquam non bibere nec vesci pane, sed sorbitiunculas delicatas et contrita holera betarumque sucum non calice sorbere sed conca. pro pudor! non erubescimus istiusmodi ineptiis nec taedet superstitionis. insuper etiam famam abstinentiae in deliciis quaerimus. fortissimum ieiunium est aqua et panis, sed quia gloriam non habet et omnes pane et aqua vivimus, quasi publicum et commune ieiunium non putatur.

13 (1) cave ne hominum rumusculos aucuperis, ne offensam dei populorum laude conmutes. “si adhuc”, inquit apostolus, “hominibus placerem, Christi servus non essem”; desivit placere hominibus et servus factus est Christi. per bonam et malam famam, a dextris et a sinistris, Christi miles graditur. nec laude extollitur nec vituperatione frangitur, non divitiis tumet non contrahitur paupertate, et laeta contemnit et tristia. per diem sol non uret eum neque luna per noctem. (2) nolo te orare in angulis platearum, ne rectum iter precum tuarum frangat aura popularis. nolo te dilatare fimbrias et ostentui habere phylacteria et conscientia repugnante Pharisaica ambitione circumdari. melius est haec in corde portare quam in corpore, deum habere fautorem, non aspectus hominum. vis scire quales dominus quaerat ornatus? habeto iam, iustitiam, temperantiam, fortitudinem. (3) his plagis caeli includere, haec te quadriga velut aurigam Christi ad metam concitum ferat. nihil hoc monili pretiosius, nihil hac gemmarum varietate distinctius. ex omni parte decoraris, cingeris atque protegeris; et ornamento tibi sunt et munimini. gemmae vertuntur in scuta.

14 (1) cave quoque ne aut linguam aut aures habeas prurientes, id est, ne aut ipse aliis detahas aut alios audias detrahentes. “sedens”, inquit, “adversus fratrem tuum loquebaris et adversus filium matris tuae ponebas scandalum; haec fecisti et tacui. existimasti iniquitatem quod ero tibi similis; arguam te et statuam contra faciem tuam”. subauditur: sermones tuos et cuncta quae de aliis es locutus ut tua sententia iudiceris in his ipse deprehensus quae in aliis arguebas. (2) neque vero illa iusta est excusatio: “referentibus aliis

pistachios? All horticultural resources are strained so that we may avoid eating common bread. (2) Furthermore, I have been told that there are certain men who contravene the natural and social order and do not drink water or eat bread but slurp fancy purées and crushed herbs and beet juice from a shell rather than from a cup. Shame on us for not blushing at such foolishness and for not being disgusted at such superstition! Moreover, we seek a reputation for abstinence amidst our dainties. The strictest fast is bread and water, but since this has no cachet and we all subsist on bread and water, it is not regarded as a fast because it supposedly is an ordinary and common thing.

13 (1) Beware of seeking adulation from the multitude, lest you garner praise from people and thereby lose favor with God. The Apostle says: "If I still pleased men, I would not be a servant of Christ"; he stopped pleasing men and became a servant of Christ. The soldier of Christ marches on through good report and bad, on the right and on the left. He is neither puffed up by praise nor discouraged by criticism; he is neither conceited due to his riches nor depressed by poverty; and he despises joy and sorrow alike. The sun will not burn him by day, nor the moon by night. (2) I do not want you to pray on street corners, lest the wind of popular approval interrupt the straight course of your prayers. I do not want you to lengthen your tassels or show off your phylacteries and wrap yourself in Pharaical self-seeking, against the better judgment of your conscience. It is better to carry these things in your heart than on your body, and better to be looked at with favor by God than by men. Do you want to know what kinds of adornments the Lord requires? Possess wisdom, justice, temperance, fortitude. (3) Let these be the four quarters of your horizon. Let this four-horse chariot usher you, Christ's charioteer, at full speed to your goal. Nothing is more precious than this necklace, nothing is brighter than this mosaic of jewels. On all sides you are adorned, girded, and safeguarded by these. They are both your decorative badge and your protective gear. Jewels are transformed into shields.

14 (1) Beware also of having an itching tongue or ears—that is, do not either slander others yourself or listen to slanderers. It is said: "You sat and spoke against your brother, and you scandalized your own mother's son. You did this and I remained silent. You thought unjustly that I will be like you, but I will reprove you and set before your face". The meaning of the passage is this: I will set before your face your words and everything you have said about others so that you may be found guilty and be implicated in the very things for which you were reprovng others. (2) It is by no means justifiable

iniuriam facere non possum". nemo invito auditori libenter refert. sagitta in lapide numquam figitur, interdum resiliens percutit dirigentem. discat detractor, dum te viderit non libenter audire, non facile detrahare: "cum detractoribus", ait Salomon, "ne miscearis quoniam repente veniet perditio eorum et ruinam utriusque quis novit?" tam videlicet eius qui detrahit quam illius qui aurem adcommodat detrahenti.

15 (1) officii tui est visitare languentes, nosse domos, matronas ac liberos earum et nobilium virorum non ignorare secreta. officii ergo tui est non solum oculos castos servare sed et linguam. numquam de formis mulierum disputes nec alia domus quid agatur in alia per te noverit. (2) Hippocrates adiurat discipulos antequam doceat et in verba sua iurare compellit; extorquet sacramento silentium sermonem incessum habitum moresque describit. quanto magis nos, quibus animarum medicina commissa est, omnium Christianorum domos debemus amare quasi proprias! consolatores potius nos in maeroribus suis quam convivas in prosperis noverint. facile contemnitur clericus qui saepe vocatus ad prandium non recusat.

16 (1) numquam petentes raro accipiamus rogati. nescio quo enim modo etiam ipse qui deprecatur ut tribuat, cum acceperis viliores te iudicat, et mirum in modum si rogantem contempseris, plus miratur. praedicator continentiae nuptias ne conciliet. qui apostolum legit: "superest ut et qui habent uxores sic sint quasi non habentes", cur virginem cogit ut nubat? qui de monogamia sacerdos est quare viduam hortatur ut digama sit? (2) procuratores et dispensatores domorum alienarum atque villarum quomodo esse possunt qui proprias iubentur contemnere facultates? amico quippiam rapere furtum est, ecclesiam fraudare sacrilegium est. accepisse pauperibus erogandum et esurientibus plurimis vel cautum esse velle vel timidum aut, quod apertissimi sceleris est, aliquid inde subtrahere, omnium praedonum crudelitatem superat. (3) ego fame torqueor et tu iudicas quantum ventri meo satis sit? aut divide statim quod acceperis aut, si timidus dispensator

to use the excuse: "I cannot be rude to others when they report things". No one readily tells anything to an unwilling listener. An arrow never lodges in a stone, but it does sometimes recoil and strike the shooter. Let the slanderer learn from your reluctance to listen that he should not be so prone to slandering. Solomon says: "Have nothing to do with slanderers, for their destruction will come suddenly, and who knows the ruin of them both?"—the ruin, that is, of both the slanderer and the person who lends an ear to him.

15 (1) It is your duty to visit the sick, to be acquainted with households, matrons and their children, and to not be ignorant of the private matters of noblemen. It is your duty, then, to keep chaste not only your eyes but also your tongue. Never discuss women's looks, and let not one household find out from you what is going on in another household. (2) Hippocrates, before he would instruct his students, adjured them and made them swear on his words. Through an oath he bound them to confidentiality and prescribed how they should talk, walk, dress, and carry themselves. How much more incumbent is it upon us, who have been entrusted with the healing of souls, to love all Christian households as if they were our own! Let them know us as comforters in sorrow rather than as table-companions in prosperity. The clergyman who is often invited to lunch and does not decline to go is readily reproached.

16 (1) Let us never seek after gifts and rarely accept them when begged to do so. For somehow even the very man who asks permission to give you a gift thinks less of you when you accept it, and, strange to say, he has more respect for you if you refuse his entreaties. Let not the proclaimer of chastity arrange marriages. The Apostle says: "It remains that those who have wives should act as if they had none"; why does a man who reads these words press a virgin to marry? Why does a man whose priesthood is defined by single marriage urge a widow to remarry? (2) How can clergymen be managers and stewards of other people's homes and rural estates when they are ordered to renounce their own property? To steal anything from a friend is theft; to defraud the church is sacrilege. To receive what is supposed to be handed over to the poor and to be either circumspect or hesitant when the masses are starving, or—what is the most blatant crime imaginable—to abscond with a portion of it, puts the savagery of all brigands to shame. (3) I am racked with hunger and you decide how much my stomach needs? Either distribute immediately what you have received or, if you are a hesitant steward, send the donor away so that he can hand out his own gifts. I do not want your

es, dimitte largitorem ut sua ipse distribuatur. nolo sub occasione mea sacculus tuus plenus sit. nemo me melius mea servare potest. optimus dispensator est qui sibi nihil reservat.

17 (1) coegisti me, Nepotiane carissime, lapidato iam virginitatis libello, quem sanctae Eustochiae Romae scripseram, post annos decem rursus Bethlem ora reserare et confodiendum me linguis omnium prodere. aut enim nihil scribendum fuit ne hominum iudicium subiremus, quod tu facere prohibuisti, aut scribentes nosse cunctorum adversum nos maledicorum tela torquenda. (2) quos obsecro ut quiescant et desinant maledicere; non enim ut adversarii sed ut amici scripsimus, nec invecti sumus in eos qui peccant sed ne peccent monuimus. neque in illos tantum sed et in nos ipsos severi iudices fuimus volentesque festucam de oculo alterius tollere nostram prius trabem eiecimus. nullum laesi, nullus saltim descriptione signatus est, neminem specialiter meus sermo pulsavit: generalis de vitiis disputatio est. qui mihi irasci voluerit, prius ipse de se quod talis sit confitetur.

money-bag to be full on my account. No one can look after what is mine better than I. The best almoner is the one who keeps back nothing for himself.

17 (1) The treatise on virginity that I wrote for the saintly Eustochium at Rome has already been attacked with stones, and yet, my dearest Nepotian, you have compelled me to open my mouth again at Bethlehem and to expose myself to the vicious attacks of everyone's tongue. For either I should have written nothing so as to avoid criticism, which you made impossible, or I write, knowing full well that that the spears of all calumniators will be hurled at me. (2) I implore them to be still and stop their verbal abuse. After all, I have written not as an adversary but as a friend, and I have not attacked those who sin but have admonished them not to sin. I have been a stern judge not only of them but also of myself, and, when I have wanted to take the speck out of another's eye I have first removed the beam from my own eye. I have wronged no one, no one has so much as been identified by description, my discourse has assailed nobody in particular: my discussion of vices has been general. Let he who feels inclined to be angry at me first admit that he is the sort of person being described.





## COMMENTARY

*Ad Nepotianum* The MSS variously give the title of the work as *Ad Nepotianum* (*presbyterum*), *De institutione clericorum*, *Institutio clerici et monachi*, *De vita clericorum*, *De habitu clericorum*, *De vita et honestate clericorum*, to name a few (Lambert, 1A.21; cf. Hilberg's *apparatus criticus*). Hilberg printed *Ad Nepotianum presbyterum* on the authority of *P*, but I have adopted *Ad Nepotianum*. This slightly more simplified form is attested in  $\epsilon$ , the oldest MS containing the text of *Epistula* 52, and it also is the one by which Jer. designates the letter at *comm. in Ion.*, prol. ll. 6–7 and *epist.* 125.8.2 (the scribal shorthand formula *Ad* + recipient's name in acc. was Jer.'s preferred method for referencing his epistolary treatises; see e.g. *vir. ill.* 135). Even still, this form would not have been present in the original letter sent to Nepotian but only in copies made for dissemination (*Hieronymi*, identifying authorship, would have preceded *Ad Nepotianum*). What we would find in the original is instead a standard opening salutation, either *Hieronymus Nepotiano salutem* (cf. *Hieronimus Nepotiano suo salutem* in  $\Sigma$ ) or some more adorned variation such as *Hieronymus dilectissimo filio Nepotiano salutem* that contained the three basic ingredients of the opening salutation, i.e. the *intitulatio* (sender's name in nom. = *Hieronymus*), the *inscriptio* (recipient's name in dat. = *Nepotiano* + epithet, e.g. *dilectissimo*), and the *salutatio* proper (greeting = *salutem*); on salutation formulae more generally, see C. Lanham, *Salutatio Formulas in Latin Letters to 1200: Syntax, Style, and Theory* (Munich, 1975).

## Chapter 1

Jer. opens his epistolary treatise by explaining its occasion in such a way as to emphasize his own spiritual authority, which Nepotian has of course duly recognized by his very act of bombarding him with so many requests for guidance. Jer. briefly but poignantly evokes his status as a veteran monk, in which he fundamentally grounds his authority as a preceptor on the Christian life. He makes specific mention of a letter that he wrote to Nepotian's uncle Heliodorus when he was living allegedly as a monastic hermit in the Syrian outback. The reference to this letter is meant on one level to lend a certain sense of historical validity to an experience that—in the flamboyant terms in which Jer. presented it—would likely have sounded outlandish and implausible to many contemporary western Christians for whom asceticism was a more ‘civilized’ affair (cf. Cain 2009a, 37–38). This reference also provides a point of departure for Jer.'s self-portrayal as a sagacious *senex*, a literary *persona* that he develops throughout the opening chapters of the letter. For he says that when he wrote to Heliodorus he was still captivated by the rhetorical conceits of the schools, and he contrasts this wayward attitude of his youth with the austere outlook that he now has as a weathered old monk whose sole focus is on the things of God (yet ironically he couches the disavowal of his classical education in three different Virgilian quotations).

## 1.1

*petis ... litteris transmarinis et crebro petis ut tibi ... digeram ...* Cf. Jer.'s later recollection of Nepotian's persistence: *quotiens ille transmarinis epistulis deprecatus est ut aliquid ad se scriberem* (epist. 60.11.1); in the same letter he refers to his young admirer affectionately as ἐργοδιώκτης *noster* on account of his tenacity (1.2). The opening to *Epistula* 52 is akin to the one for *Epistula* 54 to Furia: *obsecras litteris et suppliciter deprecaris ut tibi rescribam, immo scribam, quomodo vivere debeas et viduitatis coronam inlaeso pudicitiae nomine conservare*. Jer. immediately configures his relationship with both addressees as that of teacher and pupil and stresses their due diligence in seeking out his advice (*petis ... et crebro petis; obsecras ... et suppliciter deprecaris*), with two intended effects: to reinforce their sense of dependence upon him for their spiritual welfare, and to affirm—for the benefit of the indefinitely large readership envisaged for both works (see on 4.3 *ceteros erudit*)—his (purported) popularity as a trusted authority on practical Christian spirituality who has no shortage of admiring disciples, especially those

from afar (hence he calls Nepotian's barrage of letters to him *litterae transmarinae*). Indeed, the very fact that both Nepotian and Furia so insistently approach Jer., in distant Bethlehem, rather than authorities in their own native Italy, implies that he is in a position to offer premium-quality spiritual counsel which these local authorities simply are incapable of providing (he deploys this self-aggrandizing tactic especially in his correspondence with Gallic Christians; see Cain 2003 and 2009b).

*Nepotiane carissime* This vocative formula is repeated at the conclusion of the letter (17.1). The superlative *carissimus* (cf. προσφιλέστατος), as a conveyor of friendship sentiment, is commonplace in ancient letters (O'Brien, 94–96). In the paraenetic context of *Epistula* 52 this adjectival endearment enables the advisor to establish a friendly rapport with his advisee; cf. Greg. Naz. *orat.* 32.4, on how mutual trust and affection are necessary interrelated components of the ideal teacher-student relationship.

*brevi volumine* The word *volumen*, in its strictly codicological sense, originally meant a roll of papyrus forming a book or part of a book, but it also could designate a literary work: e.g. Jer. also calls his *Epitaphium sanctae Paulae* a *volumen* (*epist.* 108.33.1); for his usage of this term, see Arns, 118–122. At *epist.* 60.11.2 he characterizes the letter to Nepotian as a *brevis libellus*, but *libellus* need not imply an affectation of modesty, for by the fourth century this word had relinquished its diminutive sense (Arns, 106) and often was used interchangeably with *liber* (see *TLL* VII 2 viii.1269.9 ff.), and indeed elsewhere Jer. calls *Epistula* 52 a *liber* (*comm. in Ion.*, prol. l. 7, *epist.* 125.8.2). He also calls *epist.* 22 both a *liber* (*comm. in Gal.* 3.5.19–21 l. 160, *adv. Iov.* 1.13, *epist.* 49.18.3, 123.17.3, 130.19.3) and a *libellus* (*epist.* 22.2.2, 31.2.2, 52.17.1; cf. Sulp. Sev. *dial.* 1.8.4; Ruf. *apol. adv. Hier.* 2.5, 6, 13); cf. Adkin, 28–29.

*praecepta vivendi* This phrase is standard in religious and philosophical contexts from Cicero onward (e.g. Cic. *fin.* 5.4.11, *off.* 3.5; Lact. *div. inst.* 3.8.8, 4.24.7; Paul. Nol. *epist.* 50.4; Aug. *doctr. chr.* 2.9; cf. *TLL* X 2 iii.456.22 ff.). Jer. uses it further down at 4.3 and also at *comm. in Is.* 15.56.4–5 ll. 11–12, *epist.* 123.10.1. Here the word *praecepta* has the specialized connotation of *monastic* precepts which it acquired during the fourth and fifth centuries (see e.g. John Cass. *inst.* 4.10, 7.9.1, *coll.* 14.7.2, 16.1, 17.13, 18.2.1, 19.8.2, 20.1.1, 20.2.2).

*saeculi militia* At *epist.* 60.9.2 Jer. notes that Nepotian had served for some unknown duration of time in *palatii militia*. This *militia* refers not to the

real army (*militia armata*) but to the imperial administration (*militia officialis*). Ever since Diocletian's reign civil servants had been called *milites*, yet despite this shared nomenclature there was a clear practical distinction between them and mobile troops (Jones, 566; for the various palatine offices, see further Jones, 572–586). Thus, Nepotian was a bureaucratic functionary (see Rebenich, 254), just like his uncle Heliodorus had been prior to embarking upon a career in the church. Below at 5.3 Nepotian's *militia saeculi* is contrasted with his *militia Christi* as a monastic clergyman.

Nepotian and his uncle were by no means the only people known to have resigned from either military service or the imperial administration to pursue a career in the church or monasticism. Others include: Innocentius (Pall. *hist. Laus.* 44.1); Eleusius of Cyzicus (Soz. *hist. eccl.* 4.20); Marathonius of Nicomedia (Soz. *hist. eccl.* 4.27); Martin of Tours and Victricius of Rouen (Paul. Nol. *epist.* 18); Siderius of Palaebisca (Syn. Cyr. *epist.* 67); Marcian (Soz. *hist. eccl.* 6.9); Evocius of Uzala (Aug. *conf.* 9.8); Dalmatius (Anon. v. Is. 4.17); Victor (Paul. Nol. *epist.* 25.1); and other *anonymi* (Paul. Mil. v. *Ambr.* 35.1; Anon. *hist. mon.* 23.2; Pall. *hist. Laus.* 68.1).

*derelicta* The perfect participle has a twofold sense here, both (literally) of leaving a profession (e.g. Aug. *epist.* 189.5; cf. *TLL* V 1 iii.628.6 ff.) and (figuratively) of renouncing the world (e.g. Jer. *epist.* 58.4.2, 78.2.3; Salv. *gub. dei* 3.3.15; Aster. *ad Ren.* 8.18). According to Jer. (*epist.* 60.9.9), even when Nepotian was a civil servant he was a committed ascetic: he fasted until his face was pale from malnourishment and he wore a coarse goathair shirt underneath his uniform, yet by the same token his *servitus dei* was not complete until he had relinquished his secular post to formally pursue a twin vocation as a monk and priest.

*vel ... vel* Not “either ... or”, as translators habitually misconstrue it—e.g. Carroll, 80: “a monk or priest”; Cola, 1.444: “vita monacale o clericale”; Fre-mantle, 89: “a monk or a clergyman”; Labourt, 2.172: “moine ou clerc”; Ruiz Bueno, 1.406: “el monacato o la clerecía”; Wright, 189: “a monk or a clergyman”. This construction, as it is deployed here, has rather the cumulative sense of *et ... et* (cf. Vogüé, 2.355), as it does also below at 5.1 (*qui autem vel ipse pars domini est vel dominum partem habet*). The equivalence of *vel ... vel* to *et ... et* had been present already in Plautus (cf. Gildersleeve-Lodge, § 494.3), but it became more common in late Latin (cf. Draeger, 2.141–142; Hofmann-Szantyr, 502; Skahill, 189). This is the meaning of the construction in e.g. Greg. Tur. *glor. mart.* 57 *vel ipsius vel sociorum eius* (on this passage, see Cain 2005b). Thus, according to Jer., Nepotian did not renounce his secular

career to become a priest and not a monk, or a monk and not a priest, but rather he intended to become both simultaneously (on his double identity, cf. 4.4 *cum ille te monachum erudierit, hic clericum doceat esse perfectum*). Additionally, that *monachus* precedes *clericus* in the present passage is Jer.'s conscious projection of his personal conviction, which vividly animates the letter to Nepotian, that a monastic lifestyle is a prerequisite of ecclesiastical office.

*monachus* The earliest attested use of the noun μοναχός for a Christian monk is found in a civil petition dated to 324 in which the petitioner names 'the monk Isaac' as intervening on his behalf in a dispute over a cow; see E.A. Judge, "The Earliest Use of *Monachos* for 'Monk' (P. Coll. Youtie 77) and the Origins of Monasticism," *JAC* 20 (1977): 72–89. A quarter-century later this word, remaining close to its etymological root μόνος, appeared over forty times in the *Life of Antony* alone, where it means "a monk who aspires to be alone" (F.F. Takeda, "Monastic Theology of the Syriac Version of the *Life of Antony*," *StudPatr* 35 [2001]: 148–157 [149]). This term, like its Latin transliteration *monachus*, was the primary word for 'monk' in fourth- and fifth-century Christian literature; see M. Choat, "The Development and Usage of Terms for 'Monk' in Late Antique Egypt," *JbAC* 45 (2002): 5–23; Lorie, 24–34; F.E. Morard, "*Monachos*, moine: histoire du terme grec jusqu'au 4<sup>e</sup> siècle— influences bibliques et gnostiques," *FZPhTh* 20 (1973): 332–411; E. Wipszycka, *Moines et communautés monastiques en Égypte (IV<sup>e</sup>–VIII<sup>e</sup> siècles)* (Warsaw, 2009), 292–294.

*coeperit* This is the perfect subjunctive, not the future perfect. By proper classical prose usage *coeperit* should be in the indicative mood (i.e. *coepit*) in this particular situation. Its subjunctive mood here exemplifies the tendency in Jer. (cf. Goelzer, 359–360) and other late Latin authors such as Cassiodorus (cf. Skahill, 204–205) to deploy the subjunctive irregularly and indiscriminately in places where the indicative would otherwise be preferred in classical Latin (cf. on 1.1 *dum essem ... et ... refrenarem*).

*clericus* The substantive *clericus* (κληρικός) for 'clergyman' (*TLL* III 6.1339.48 ff.) had been used already by Cyprian in the third century and was standard usage by the late fourth century. It broadly refers to any ordained minister of the church (as opposed to a layman), and thus with this purposefully ambiguous term Jer. is applying an ascetic standard not just to priests like Nepotian but to all those who have taken holy orders. *clericus* is derived from the Christian neologism *clerus* (κλήρος), whose meaning as 'clergy' is

attested for the first time in Latin patristic literature starting in the early third century; see J. Congar, *Jalons pour une théologie du laïc* (Paris, 1961), 19–45; D. Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church* (Cambridge, 1995), 127–128; cf. *TDNT* 3.758–764. The first Greek patristic author on record to use κληρος in the sense of ‘clergy’ appears to have been Clement of Alexandria (*q.d.s.* 42.2).

*rectum Christi tramitem teneat ne ad diversa vitiorum diverticula rapiatur*

The elaborate period with which the letter opens is given a strong euphonic and rhetorical finish, with alliteration, paronomasia (*diversa ... diverticula*), and antithesis-cum-metaphor (*rectum Christi tramitem ... vitiorum diverticula*); for *deverticulum* (or *diverticulum*) in the sense of *via ad errorem ducens*, see *TLL* V 1 iv.824.25 ff. Paulinus of Nola describes his own spiritual journey in comparably precarious terms: *angusta enim via gradimur et quasi in fune suspenso ancipites ambulamus, et nisi certo libramine mentis vestigia fixerimus, ut non declinemus dextra vel sinistra, facile nos in huius aut illius partis ruinam inimicus inpellet* (*epist.* 40.11). Cf. Greg. Naz. *orat.* 2.34 οὕτω καὶ τοῦτοις ὁποτέρωσσε νεύσῃ τις, εἴτε διὰ κακίαν, εἴτε δι’ ἀμάθειαν, κίνδυνος οὐχ ὁ τυχῶν αὐτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς ἀγομένοις τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας πτώματος. ἀλλ’ ὁδῶ βασιλικῇ πορευτέον ὄντως, καὶ περισκεπτέον, μήτε εἰς δεξιὰ μήτε εἰς ἀριστερὰ, καθὼς αἱ Παροιμίαι φασὶν, ἐκκλίνοντας.

*tramitem* The use of *trames* in a figurative sense for philosophical and especially religious pursuits is very common in patristic Latin; see e.g. Tert. *apol.* 47; Lact. *div. inst.* 6.7.5; Ambr. *hex.* 1.8.31, 5.7.19; Jer. *epist.* 130.17.3; John Cass. *coll.* 16.5, *inst.* 12.15.1.

*dum essem adulescens immo paene puer et primos impetus lascivientis aetatis heremi durtia refrenarem* Now that Jer. has cursorily outlined the occasion of his letter, the reader naturally expects him to proceed directly with his instruction. However, the logical sequence of the treatise does not resume until ch. 5, when the presentation of hortatory content formally commences. The intervening text (1.1b–4.4) is taken up with a rather intricate digression, acknowledged in retrospect at 4.1 (*quorsum haec tam longo repetita principio?*), which at first glance seems to have no bearing on the central thesis of the letter, though in fact it is integral to Jer.’s overall authorial design, inasmuch as he uses it to establish his credentials as an expert on ascetic ethics and thereby justifies his right to presume to teach Nepotian, citing his life-long monastic experience which has now culminated in his pious *senectus* (on the neophyte ascetic’s need for a spiritual guide who has a superabundance of both theoretical knowledge and firsthand experience living the

holy life, see e.g. Greg. Nys. *virg.* 23.2; Anon. *hist. mon.* 24.1; John Cass. *inst.* 12.15.1). To demonstrate the universality of his points about the sagacity of old age, and also to impress the reader with his (supposedly) encyclopedic erudition, he assembles an array of *exempla* culled from both biblical and classical history and literature. Moreover, to a limited extent this excursus matches Quintilian's generic description (*inst. orat.* 4.3.1–2) of the sort of entertaining but extraneous digressions into which many orators of his day would launch immediately after making a concise introductory statement of the facts of their cases. Quintilian considered this contemporary custom a vice because the orators in question, he alleged, made such digressions only to flaunt their talents.

Jer. opens his excursus, which amounts to something of a miniature Christian treatise *de senectute*, with a picturesque autobiographical reflection upon his earliest days as a monk. He alludes in particular to his stay near the Syrian town of Chalcis between c.375 and c.377. He says first that he was a 'young man' (*adulescens*) but straightaway retracts this claim with the epidiorthetic *immo* and clarifies that he was 'almost a boy' (*paene puer*). In Hieronymian parlance an *adulescens* is anyone under thirty-three years of age, while a *puer* is a male up to the age of nineteen years (see Hamblenne; by contrast, for Cicero, whom Jer. is imitating in part in this passage [see below], *adulescentia* hypothetically covered a broader period—from the ages of fourteen to forty-six; cf. J. Jiménez Delgado, "Concepto de *adulescens* en Cicerón," in *Atti del I congresso internazionale di studi Ciceroniani* [2 vols., Rome, 1961], 2.433–452). Now, it is an historical fact that Jer., who was born most probably around 347 (see e.g. Rebenich, 21), was in his late twenties or early thirties during his monastic experiment in Syria. This means that he was already at least a decade removed from *pueritia* and also nearing the conclusion of his *adulescentia*. In the present passage he creatively adjusts the chronology of his own life so as to inflate himself into a former monastic child prodigy, as it were: while his peers were revelling in teenage vices, he was curbing youthful lusts with the 'austerity of the desert' (*heremi duritia*). In this respect Jer.'s literary self-presentation plays upon the popular ancient *topos* of the *puer senex* (παιδαριοςγέρων), which is particularly prominent in early monastic biography and related literature; see e.g. Athan. *v. Ant.* 1.2–3; Greg. Nys. *v. Greg. Thaum.* p. 8 Heil; Jer. *epist.* 24.3.1; Anon. *hist. mon.* 8.2, 12.1; Pall. *hist. Laus.* 17.2; Cyr. Scyth. *v. Euth.* p. 13 Schwartz, *v. Sab.* p. 88 Schwartz; cf. more generally M. Amerise, *Girolamo e la senectus: età della vita e morte nell'epistolario* (Rome, 2008), 122–128; M. Bambeck, "Puer et puella senes bei Ambrosius von Mailand: zur altchristlichen Vorgeschichte eines literarischen Topos," *RomForsch* 84 (1972): 257–313; T. Carp, "Puer senex



in Roman and Medieval Thought," *Latomus* 39 (1980): 736–739. On infant prodigies in the Greco-Roman world, see M. Kleijwegt, *Ancient Youth: The Ambiguity of Youth and the Absence of Adolescence in Greco-Roman Society* (Amsterdam, 1991), 123–131.

The chronological discrepancy is not the only deliberately misleading facet of the statement in question. Even more suspect is Jer.'s characterization of the location of his monastic experiment as a 'desert' (*heremus*). It is now generally recognized that here and elsewhere in his writings where he reflects back upon his brief time as a hermit in Syria, he grossly exaggerates the facts in an attempt to bring his biography in line with contemporary Oriental monastic stereotypes (see e.g. Rebenich, 86–98). He stayed not in a cave or in a barren, sun-scorched wilderness, as he ever so tantalizingly leads us to believe, but on an expansive semi-rural estate owned by his wealthy patron Evagrius. He did not live in complete solitude, either, but had at his disposal a team of copyists and was visited frequently by Evagrius and also kept in constant contact with friends in Antioch and Aquileia, as his representative correspondence (*epist.* 5–17) from this period attests. Nevertheless, at numerous junctures in his literary career Jer. found it expedient to appeal to this romanticized portrayal of his monastic experience in the exotic eastern 'desert' as a means to justify his claim of being an authoritative teacher of Christian asceticism (see *epist.* 22.7, 22.30, 125.12; cf. Cain 2006a and 2009a, 145–158). Jer.'s compelling self-portraiture as a solitary anchorite had a legacy long outlasting his own lifetime, for it inspired a rich iconographic tradition among Italian Renaissance portraitists; see B. Ridderbos, *Saint and Symbol: Images of Saint Jerome in Early Italian Art* (Groningen, 1984), 63–88; D. Russo, *Saint Jérôme en Italie: étude d'iconographie et de spiritualité (XIII<sup>e</sup>–XV<sup>e</sup> siècle)* (Paris, 1987), 201–251.

Jer.'s citation of his eremitical experience in the preamble to the letter to Nepotian assumes additional significance when it is viewed against the backdrop both of his well-known antagonism toward Ambrose of Milan (see e.g. Cain 2005a) and of the intriguing possibility that he formulated this writing to rival and even supplant the compendious *De officiis*, which Ambrose had released a few years earlier between 388 and 390, as the definitive manual on pastoral duties in the Latin-speaking West (see Cain 2009a, 146–151); for a synoptic comparison of the two works, see I. Davidson, "Pastoral Theology at the End of the Fourth Century: Ambrose and Jerome," *StudPatr* 33 (1997): 295–301. In the preface (1.4) to his own writing Ambrose makes the following candid confession: *ego enim raptus de tribunalibus atque administrationis infulis ad sacerdotium, docere vos coepi quod ipse non didici. itaque factum est ut prius docere inciperem quam discere. discendum igitur mihi*

*simul et docendum est quoniam non vacavit ante discere*; cf. H. Savon, “Les intentions de saint Ambroise dans la préface du *De officiis*,” in M. Soetard (ed.), *Valeurs dans le stoïcisme, du portique à nos jours* (Lille, 1993), 155–169, who argues that Ambrose’s frankness is genuine and goes beyond conventional rhetorical self-depreciation. The bishop alludes to the utter lack of advance preparation that he had received prior to assuming his pastoral duties as bishop of Milan: a week before his ordination (7 December 374) and installment into one of the premier western bishoprics he had been an unbaptized catechumen with no formal theological training (for the circumstances of his ordination, see N. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan* [Berkeley, 1994], 1–13). While Ambrose frankly admits that he has taught men how to be dutiful clergymen before first learning the clerical ropes himself, Jer. presumes to offer such instruction only because he is a committed ascetic who has what he implies to be a *lifetime* of rigorous spiritual training to his credit. The contrast between the two men’s qualifications, which would have been readily apparent to any ancient reader on account of their placement at the beginning of each work, could not be any more glaring, and this, I suggest, is precisely the rhetorical effect for which Jer. is aiming.

*adulescens immo paene puer* The formulation *adulescens immo paene puer* recurs, but with the substitution of *et* for the more vivid *immo*, two other times in Jer.’s *œuvre*: he applies it to the emperor Valentinian (*epist.* 60.15.4 *adulescens Valentinianus et paene puer*) and to his much younger brother Paulinian (*epist.* 82.8.1 *adulescentulum et paene puerum*). His model for this verbal collocation was Cicero; cf. *Phil.* 3.3 *adulescens paene potius puer, epist. ad Brut.* 1.18.3 *pro adolescentulo ac paene puero* (it may be noted that in both of these passages Cicero employs threefold alliteration, initial-sequent in the first and initial-interrupted in the second, which may perhaps be compared with Jer.’s own threefold alliteration in *paene puer et primos*).

While Jer. was imitating Cicero, he was in turn imitated by St. Patrick, who describes himself as being an *adulescens, immo paene puer inverbis* (*conf.* 10.7–9) when he was fifteen and kidnapped by pirates from his family’s estate (see Cain 2010d). In this Patrician passage *inverbis* does not mean ‘unable to speak’ but ‘beardless’ (cf. *imberbis*). In Vulgar Latin there was a phonetic confusion between *b* et *v* (Mohrmann, 1.411–413). R.E. Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources* (London, 1994), 259, classifies *inverbis* as a late Latin *falsa lectio* for *imberbis*, and *TLL* VII 1.424–425 (with VII. 2.161) similarly identifies *inverbis/inverbus* as a variant spelling of *imberbis/imberbus*.

*primos impetus lascivientis aetatis* Jer. employs the phrase *lasciviens aetas* also at *epist.* 121.8.19 as well as at *comm. in Gal.* 2.4.1–2, where, as in the letter to Nepotian, he couples it with *refrenare: paedagogus parvulis adsignatur ut lasciviens refrenetur aetas et prona in vitia corde teneantur*; cf. Ps.-Quint. *decl. mai.* 15.10. For the related phrase *lasciva aetas*, see Hor. *epist.* 2.2.216; Ambr. *exp. Ps.* 118 2.1; Jer. *comm. in Zach.* 2.8 l. 78, *epist.* 58.1.2, 107.4.1.

For the ancient stereotype that the young are by nature prone to lustful impulses, see on 3.3 *nec ... sapientia*.

*heremi durtia* [*h*]eremus, ‘desert’, is transliterated from the feminine substantive ἐρήμος. Its popularity among Latin patristic authors as a synonym for *desertum* (see *TLL* V 1 v.747.45 ff.; cf. Jer. *epist.* 106.86.2 ἐρήμος autem desertum vel solitudinem significat) is due probably to its occurrence in Old Latin biblical translations (so Burton, 145–146). See further K. Bosl, “Eremus. Begriffsgeschichtliche Bemerkungen zum historischen Problem der Entfremdung und Vereinsamung des Menschen,” in *Polychordia* (Leiden, 1963), 73–90; J. Leclercq, “Eremus et eremita. Pour l’histoire du vocabulaire de la vie solitaire,” *COCR* 25 (1963): 8–30; Loricé, 51–58.

*durtia*, here an abl. of means, is an allusion not only to the harsh climate of the ‘desert’ but also to the exercises of monastic discipline—e.g. fasting (see on 3.1–2 *ieiunia*) and prayer (see on 3.1–2 *standi in oratione perseverantia*)—by which he quelled his lusts; cf. *TLL* V 1 xi.2291.12 ff.

*dum essem ... et ... refrenarem* *dum*, as ‘while’ or ‘during the time that’ (its sense in the present passage), usually takes the indicative mood, but in imperial prose and poetry as well as in colloquial Latin it sometimes takes the imperfect subjunctive in narrative contexts where a *cum* temporal clause (with the imperfect subjunctive) would otherwise be expected; see E. Hoffmann, *Konstruktion der lateinischen Zeitpartikeln* (Vienna, 1860), 99–101; L. Kühnast, *Livianische Syntax* (Berlin, 1872), 236; cf. on 1.1 *coeperit*. For early examples of this phenomenon, see Liv. *a.u.c.* 1.40.7 *dum intentus in eum se rex totus averteret, alter elatam securim in caput deiecit*; Virg. *georg.* 4.457–459 *illa quidem, dum te fugeret per flumina praeceps, ... hydrum non vidit in herba*. This conflation of *dum* and *cum* in prose became more prominent than ever before in the fourth century; for numerous examples in Aurelius Victor, Ammianus Marcellinus, and the *Historia Augusta*, see C. Paucker, *Spicilegium addendorum lexicis latinis* (Mitau, 1875), 67, and for some examples in Jer., see *epist.* 10.3.3 *sed nescio quomodo, etiamsi aqua plena sit, tamen eundem odorem lagoena servat, quo, dum rudis esset, inbuta est*, 22.30.3 *dum ita me antiquus serpens inluderet*, 48.18.2 *dum adviveret sanc-*

*tae memoriae Damasus*, 125.12.1 *dum essem iuvenis et solitudinis me deserta vallarent*, 130.16.1 *dum esses parvula et sanctae ac beatae memoriae Anastasius episcopus Romanam regeret ecclesiam*; cf. Goelzer, 358–359; Skahill, 223–224.

*avunculum tuum* Heliodorus is named as Nepotian's [maternal] uncle also below at 4.4 and 7.3, nine times in *epist.* 60, and once at *epist.* 77.1.1. Nepotian's father died when he was a child (*parvulus*), and Heliodorus helped his sister raise the boy, stepping in as his surrogate father (*epist.* 60.9.1). Cf. M. Bettini, *Antropologia e cultura romana* (Rome, 1986), 27–49, on how the uncle in Roman society traditionally was regarded as a figure of stern paternal advice, especially in the absence of the father.

*sanctum* At *epist.* 6.2.1 Jer. refers to him as *sanctus frater Heliodorus*. In late antique ecclesiastical idiom *sanctus* (ἅγιος) is used for both higher-ranked clergymen (priests and bishops) and laypeople (i.e. martyrs and exceptionally holy Christians; in time it acquired the additional, strictly technical sense of a canonized saint). For *sanctus* and its various usages, see H. Delehay, *Sanctus. Essai sur le culte des saints dans l'antiquité* (Brussels, 1927), 24–73; E. Sánchez Salor, “*Sanctus, sacer y beatus*,” *Durius* 4 (1976): 35–55, and on ἅγιος and its derivatives (ἀγιότης, ἀγιωσύνη, ἀγιώτατος), see L. Dinneen, *Titles of Address in Christian Greek Epistolography to 527 AD* (Washington, 1929), 1–4; for *sanctus* in Jer.'s epistolary honorifics, see A. Engelbrecht, *Das Titelwesen bei den spätleinischen Epistolographen* (Vienna, 1893), 26–29.

*Heliodorum* Heliodorus was a lifelong friend and literary patron of Jer. He was born sometime in the 340s and was raised in Altinum, a city in the province of Venetia-Istria and on the shores of the gulf of Venice. He first met Jer. in the early 360s, when the two studied rhetoric together in Rome. After completing his studies he served for a few years as an officer in the imperial bureaucracy but then left his secular profession to become a monk. In the early 370s he traveled to Jerusalem on a pilgrimage, and during his return trip in c.374 he stopped in Syria to visit with Jer., who at that time was experimenting with the quasi-eremitical monastic life. Jer. tried to persuade his old friend to remain by his side, but Heliodorus promptly departed thence for his hometown as soon as he was informed that his brother-in-law had died, relinquishing his monastic ambitions in the East to help his widowed sister raise the boy Nepotian (see above on *avunculum tuum*). By 381 Heliodorus had become the bishop of Altinum, as we gather from the fact that he was one of the episcopal attendees of the council of

Aquileia in early September of that same year (see *Acta conc. Aquil.* 1, 62 in CSEL 82/3:327, 362). He is in fact the first attested bishop of Altinum (see G. Cappelletti, *Le chiese d'Italia dalla loro origine sino ai nostri giorni*, vol. 9 [Venice, 1853], 516–517). Heliodorus died in or before 406. See *PCBE* 2/1.965–967 “Heliodorus 2”; Y.-M. Duval, “Aquilée et la Palestine entre 370 et 420,” *AAAd* 12 (1977): 263–322 (289–293).

*exhortatorium epistulam* At *vir. ill.* 135 Jer. mentions this work, which is printed as *Epistula* 14 in modern editions of the correspondence, and entitles it *Ad Heliodorum exhortatoria*, where *exhortatoria* functions as a substantive, though normally it is an adjective paired with either *epistula* (cf. *TLL* V 2 x.1444.9 ff.), as it is here in the letter to Nepotian (cf. e.g. *Jer. epist.* 33.4.9), or *litterae* (e.g. *Aug. epist.* 57.1) because it denotes the epistolary genre of παρα-νετικός, in which the writer recommends that the addressee adopt a specific behavior or lifestyle; see S. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia, 1986), 94–106. Jer. boasted that his Roman friend Fabiola had even memorized *epist.* 14 because she regarded it as an indispensable guide-book for her eremitic-style urban piety (*epist.* 77.9.2). In his *De conscribendis epistulis* Erasmus praises the *exhortatoria ad Heliodorum* as the finest specimen of its particular epistolary genre (*quae universum eius generis artificium una complectitur*; *OOE* 1/2:353).

*plenam lacrimis querimoniisque* Jer. is alluding to the lament he made to Heliodorus in the letter in question: *quibus lamentis, quo dolore, quo gemitu te abeuntem persecutus sim, istae quoque litterae testes sunt, quas lacrimis cernis interlitas* (*epist.* 14.1.1). The inspiration for Jer.'s pleonastic collocation *lacrimis querimoniisque* probably is Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.207 *sustinere iam populus Romanus omnium nationum non vim, non arma, non bellum, sed luctus lacrimas querimonias non potest*. This passage from the Verrines appears to be the only other attested instance in which these two nouns are juxtaposed, and, furthermore, they appear in the same order in both texts, though for syntactical reasons Jer. is unable to duplicate the Ciceronian asyndeton and opts to employ an enclitic conjunction.

*deserti sodalis* Writing to Heliodorus after Nepotian's death Jer. again characterized himself in these terms as an abandoned monastic compatriot; see *epist.* 60.9.1 *ob salutem illius [sc. Nepotiani] orientem heremumque dimiseris et me carissimum sodalem tuum*. In the letter to Nepotian he is playing upon the shared technical Christian meanings of *heremus* (see above on *heremi durtia*) and *desertum* (*quae deserti sodalis monstraret affectum*) as ‘desert’

(cf. *TLL* V 1 iii.686.66 ff.). Even though *deserti* is a perfect participle used here as a masculine adjective modifying *sodalis*, it obviously is derived from the same root verb (*deserere*) as the neuter substantive *desertum*, and, what is more, the pun implied by *deserti sodalis* (i.e. Jer. was deserted in the desert) is followed in the second half of the period by *heremus* (*heremi durtia*).

*monstraret* This verb is in the subjunctive because it is part of a relative clause (*quae deserti sodalis monstraret affectum*) which has the character of a definition and is parallel with a descriptive adjective (*plenam*) with which it is connected by the conjunction *et* (cf. Gildersleeve-Lodge, § 631.4). Additionally, *monstraret* is hyperbatic in its displacement of *affectum* from *deserti sodalis* and Jer. thereby stresses how ably his letter to Heliodorus captures his emotional intensity at the time.

## 1.2

*in illo opere* *opus* is one of the Latin words (along with e.g. *liber*) used to describe a formal literary work (cf. *TLL* IX 2 vi.849.66 ff.), and Jer.'s designation of *Epistula* 14 to Heliodorus as such is unsurprising inasmuch as a year or two earlier he had listed it alongside his other polished literary compositions in his autobiibliography at *vir. ill.* 135 (cf. on 1.1 *exhortatoriam epistulam*), even though later in this same sentence he ostensibly demeans the rhetorical artificiality of this 'work'.

*lusimus* Jer. uses the verb *ludere* to characterize his youthful rhetorical exercises as a trivial pursuit also at *comm. in Abd.*, prol. ll. 31–32, *ibid.* ll. 780–781, *c. Helv.* 22, *dial. adv. Pel.* 1.24, 3.5; cf. *OLD* sv *ludo* 8b–c. With his deployment of this verb Wiesen, 34n59, compares Horace's use of *ludere* (*sat.* 1.10.37) and *illudere* (*sat.* 1.4.39) to describe his writing of satire. When Jer. belittles the letter to Heliodorus as an immature production of his 'youth' (see following n.) he is referring to its rhetorical artificiality, which now, from the perspective of his 'old age', he deems a serious deficiency from which he conscientiously distances himself. In doing so he also is implicitly distancing himself from the letter as a whole and in particular one of its core themes, namely the fundamental incompatibility of the clerical and monastic vocations; in the letter to Nepotian of course he collapses this distinction and attempts to integrate the two vocations seamlessly. At *comm. in Abd.*, prol. ll. 43–47 he similarly dismisses a commentary on Obadiah that he had composed during his stay near Chalcis and contrasts its exegetical immaturity with his newer commentary, which he says is the product of wise old age: *hoc*

*est illud tempus, mi Pammachi, hac luce dulcior, quo egressi scholam rhetorum, diverso studio ferebamur, quando ego et Heliodorus carissimus pariter habitare solitudinem Syriae Chalcidis volebamus ... illud fuisse puerilis ingenii et hoc maturae senectutis.*

*calentibus adhuc rhetorum studiis atque doctrinis* Jer. rather pretentiously informs the general reader about his scholastic pedigree with this allusion to his formal study of rhetoric, and he does so again at 4.1—Nepotian would already have been aware of this, for his uncle had been Jer.'s fellow student in Rome (see on 1.1 *Heliodorum*); Jer. makes the announcement for the benefit rather of the indefinitely large readership envisaged for the letter (cf. on 4.3 *ceteros erudiat*). When he was around the age of twelve Jer.'s *curialis* father Eusebius sent him to Rome to receive a prestigious secondary education in Latin grammar and literature under the *grammaticus* Aelius Donatus; for Donatus' intellectual influence on Jer., particularly on his technique as a biblical exegete, see G. Brugnoli, "Donato e Girolamo," *VetChr* 2 (1965): 139–149; L. Holtz, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical* (Paris, 1981), 40–46. After completing this sequence of his scholastic studies Jer. remained in Rome to receive specialized training in rhetorical theory and declamation, schooling which was intended to prepare ambitious students for lucrative careers in law or government. He finished rhetorical school probably in his late teens, or in any case by the mid-360s and composed the *exhortatoria epistula* to Heliodorus in c.375, when he was around thirty years old and living as a monk in the Syrian 'desert' (cf. on 1.1 *dum ... refrenarem*). His claim that this work was the product of his 'youth' (*pro aetate tunc lusimus*), not long after he had emerged from rhetorical school, does not jibe at all with the actual chronology of his life, but it nevertheless is conveniently consistent with his revisionist autobiography, according to which he assigns his 'desert' experience to his *pueritia*.

*atque* This form of the conjunction is more literary than its counterpart *ac* (Hofmann-Szantyr, 477). Jer. does not show a marked preference for the one over the other in the present work: *atque* appears five times and *ac* six.

*scolastico flore* I.e. the strategies of rhetorical ornamentation (cf. *OLD* sv *flos* 11) that Jer. had learned in school (cf. on 4.1 *flosculos*).

*nunc iam* Here *nunc*, strengthened by *iam*, has a temporal meaning but also (like the Greek *νῦν δέ*) an emphatic adversative force (i.e. 'But now')

or 'Now, however') which strikingly differentiates Jer.'s state of being in the present as a mature-minded *senex* with that which he had possessed when he sent the letter to Heliodorus (*pro aetate tunc lusimus*). For *nunc* in this contrastive sense, see Sall. *bell. Iug.* 14.24; Tibull. *carm.* 1.10.13–14; Virg. *Aen.* 10.628–630.

*cano capite* In pagan and Christian antiquity white hair was recognized as one of the universal signs of *senectus* and also as a marker of wisdom; see e.g. Sen. *brev. vit.* 7.10; Clem. Alex. *paed.* 3.3.18.3; Greg. Naz. *orat.* 7.18, 26.14, 43.23; Pall. *hist. Laus.*, prol. 16, *dial.* 16; Theod. *hist. rel.* 3.17; cf. P. Birchler Émery, "Vieillards et vieilles femmes en Grèce archaïque: de la calvitie et des rides," in V. Dasen and J. Wilgaux (eds.), *Langages et métaphores du corps dans le monde antique* (Rennes, 2008), 61–72; G. Minois, *Histoire de la vieillesse en occident* (Paris, 1987), 170–172. The age bracket of 60–65 generally was considered to be the threshold of *senectus* (Cokayne, 1). At the time of writing to Nepotian Jer. was only nearing fifty, and so he still had at least another decade to age before crossing this threshold. Whether or not in reality he had (prematurely?) white hair is quite beside the point: his claim about having a *canum caput* (as well as a wrinkled brow; see following n.) is essentially a rhetorical conceit by which to shore up authority for himself by implying that he is a *senex sapiens* (just as he had once been a *puer senex*; see on 1.1 *dum ... refrenarem*). Yet it is not simply his supposedly advanced physical age, manifested by white hair, that commends him: he is a veteran ascetic with a vast accumulation of knowledge and experience on which to draw that makes him sufficiently competent to advise Nepotian on spiritual matters. Jer., then, purports to embody by his example the words that John Cassian (*coll.* 2.13) attributes to Abbot Moses: *senectus namque honorabilis non diuturna, nec numero annorum computata: cani enim sunt sensus hominis, et aetas senectutis vita immaculata. et idcirco non omnium seniorum, quorum capita canities tegit quosque vitae longaevitas sola commendat, nobis sunt sectanda vestigia seu traditiones ac monita suscipienda, sed eorum, quos laudabiliter vitam suam ac probatissime conperimus in iuventute signasse*. Cassian here invokes the literary commonplace of old age being measured not by years but by good deeds (cf. Wis. 4:8–9), a *topos* invoked by Ambrose as well at *epist.* 7.5.2.5 in reference to the deceased bishop Acholius: *ea est enim reverenda canities, quae est canities animae in canis cogitationibus et operibus effulgens. quae est enim verae aetas senectutis nisi vita immaculata, quae non diebus aut mensibus sed saeculis propagatur, cuius sine fine est diuturnitas, sine debilitate longaevitas?*



*arata fronte* This expression is Virgilian in origin (*Aen.* 7.417 *frontem obsce-  
nam rugis arat*, quoted by Jer. at *epist.* 54.14.2). The wrinkled forehead is  
a physical manifestation of old age (e.g. *Ov. trist.* 3.7.34; *Hor. epod.* 8.3–4;  
*Philostr. v. Apoll.* 8.29; *Jer. epist.* 10.2.2), and in the Hellenistic and Roman  
worlds wrinkles, like white hair (see previous n.), were commonly associated  
with sagacity (cf. Cokayne, 18–29). This is why portrait busts of intellectu-  
als such as philosophers and poets often portrayed their subjects as having  
wrinkled skin; see B. Richardson, *Old Age among the Ancient Greeks* (New  
York, 1969), 131–162; R.R.R. Smith, “Late Roman Philosopher Portraits from  
Aphrodisias,” *JRS* 80 (1990): 127–155.

*et ad instar boum pendentibus a mento palearibus* Hilberg printed: *cano  
capite et arata fronte, ad instar boum pendentibus a mento palearibus*. I have  
rejected the asyndeton resulting from his reading and have inserted *et* before  
*ad instar* on the authority of  $\Sigma$ , *D*, and *k*. All three components of the tricolon,  
rather than just the first two, may now be linked by the same conjunction  
for the sake of stylistic concinnity.

Jer. makes a playful allusion here to *Virg. georg.* 3.51–53 *optuma torvae /  
forma bovis, cui turpe caput, cui plurima cervix, / et crurum tenuis a mento  
palearia pendent*; on his reading of the *Georgics*, see e.g. N. Adkin, “Vergil’s  
*Georgics* and Jerome, *Epist.* 125,11,3–4,” *WJA* 22 (1998): 187–198; L. Alfonsi,  
“Gerolamo Vergilianus,” *Sileno* 2 (1976): 319. In his annotations on *epist.* 52  
Erasmus explains the rationale behind Jer.’s reference: “Dewlaps are the skin  
that hangs from the chin to the breast of an ox. The same thing happens  
to the aged when shrunken flesh makes the skin hang loose” (J. Brady  
and J. Olin, *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 61: *The Edition of St. Jerome*  
[Toronto, 1992], 145). Jer.’s allusion is followed immediately by one direct  
quotation from the *Georgics* and two from the *Eclogues*. Thus, after having  
just disavowed secular erudition with all of its rhetorical pomposity, which  
he implies will not intrude upon the present work as it had upon the letter  
to Heliodorus, Jer. ironically imports into his prose three different Virgilian  
passages in succession.

*frigidus obsistit circum praecordia sanguis* A retouching of *Virg. georg.*  
2.484; Jer. replaces Virgil’s future perfect *obstiterit* with the present *obsistit*,  
which still enables the verse to scan properly, but he nevertheless takes this  
line out of context. At *georg.* 2.483–484 (*sin has ne possim naturae accedere  
partis / frigidus obstiterit circum praecordia sanguis*) Virgil states his concern  
that he may not have the intellectual fortitude to capture the complexity  
of the natural world in his poetry, and he expresses his hesitation using

an Empedoclean idea; cf. Emped. fr. 105 Diels-Kranz αἷμα γὰρ ἀνθρώποις περικάρδιόν ἐστι νόημα; Cic. *Tusc. disp.* 1.19 *Empedocles animum esse censet cordi suffusum sanguinem*. Jer., by contrast, is accessing the common ancient belief that the blood becomes cold as the body ages; cf. Servius' scholium on this same Virgilian passage: *secundum physicos, qui dicunt stultos esse homines frigidioris sanguinis, prudentes calidi, unde et senes, in quibus iam friget, et pueri in quibus necdum calet, minus sapiunt*.

*idem poeta* Jer. does not name Virgil, nor is there any real need for him to do so. Not only was Virgil a canonical author in the late fourth century whose poetry every properly educated Roman gentleman had read and studied as a schoolboy (and may have continued to read and relish as an adult), but also he was the national poet and a fixture of Roman popular culture throughout the imperial period; see N. Horsfall, "Aspects of Virgilian Influence in Roman Life," in *Atti del convegno mondiale scientifico di studi su Virgilio 1981* (Milan, 1984), 2.47–63; Id., "Virgil's Impact at Rome: The Non-Literary Evidence," in N. Horsfall (ed.), *A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (Leiden, 1995), 249–255.

*"omnia fert aetas, animum quoque" ... "nunc oblita mihi tot carmina, vox quoque Moerim iam fugit"* An exact quotation of Virg. *ecl.* 9.51, 53 and the first *pes* of v. 54; on Jer.'s reading of the *Eclogues*, see N. Adkin, "Vergil, *Eclogues* 2 and 10 in Jerome," *Eirene* 35 (1999): 102–113. This is an appropriate text: Moeris, reflecting on how the memory loses its retentive powers over time, laments to Lycidas that he has forgotten all of the songs that he used to sing as a boy. Jer. quotes this Virgilian passage also at *epist.* 105.3.3, and there he uses it to aggrandize himself as a veteran of Scriptural interpretation in contrast to Augustine, whom he dismisses as a brash young upstart.

## Chapter 2

After having just quoted thrice from Virgil Jer. declares that he will now draw his *exempla* from the Bible. He focuses on King David, whose frigid old body, according to the biblical account, could be warmed only by the embraces of the young virgin Abishag the Shunammite and not by physical contact with any of his numerous wives. Jer. contends that this story cannot be taken literally, and to support his point he cites the antediluvian patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Moses, none of whom in their old age had to resort to the touch of women other than their wives.

## 2.1

*quod* A connective particle referring to what precedes (i.e. the Virgilian quotations). It has an adversative force here and may be translated as 'but' (cf. *OLD* sv *quod* 1).

*ne de gentili tantum litteratura proferre videamur* Cf. *epist.* 60.5.3 *ne videar aliena potius quam nostra quaesisse* (following a list of pagan *exempla*); *comm. in Is.* lib. 16, prol. ll. 1–4 *egregia disertissimi oratoris sententia est, felices essent artes, si de illis soli artifices iudicaret. ac ne a profanis tantum sumere videar exemplum, nimirum hoc illud est quod aliis verbis propheta demonstrat* ... Jer. employs the same narrative device at *epist.* 53.2.1 to transition from pagan to Christian *exempla*.

Along with *nationes*, *ethnici*, *pagani* (J. O'Donnell, "Paganus," *CF* 31 [1977]: 163–169; J. Zeiller, *Paganus: étude de terminologie historique* [Paris, 1917]), *gentes* (I. Opelt, "Griechische und lateinische Bezeichnungen der Nichtchristen: ein terminologischer Versuch," *VChr* 19 [1965]: 1–22) and *gentiles* (as a substantive) were the most common epithets in patristic Latin for 'pagans'. For 'secular literature' Jer. prefers to *gentilis litteratura* (a phrase he uses only here) the synonymous *gentiles litterae* (*vir. ill.*, prol., *epist.* 22.30.5, 70.5.1, 129.3.8).

*divinorum voluminum* As early as Tertullian (*adv. Iud.* 13 *divina prophetarum volumina*) *divina volumina* was one of the epithets used by Latin patristic authors for Scripture. By the late fourth century it had become a standard locution, and in Jer. alone it occurs some fifteen times.

*sacramenta* Among pagan Romans the word *sacramentum* meant principally either the soldier's oath of allegiance (F. Hinard, "Sacramentum,"

*Athenaeum* 81 [1993]: 251–263) or the legally binding oath sworn by parties in litigation (S. Tondo, “La semantica di *sacramentum* nella sfera giudiziale,” *SDHI* 35 [1969]: 249–339). By the third century it had entered into the Christian theological vocabulary. For discussions of its various shades of meaning in early Christian Latin, see e.g. J. de Ghellinck (ed.), *Pour l’histoire du mot sacramentum* (2 vols., Louvain, 1924); A. Kolping, *Sacramentum Tertulianum* (Münster, 1948); C. Mohrmann, “*Sacramentum* dans les plus anciens textes chrétiens,” *HThR* 47 (1954): 141–152. One of its regular usages is as a synonym of the biblical *μυστήριον*, and it is this sense that it has here, as the ‘mysteries’ of Scripture (cf. e.g. *comm. in Is.* 6.13.2 l. 32, *tract. in Ps.* 90 ll. 117–120 *singula verba scripturarum singula sacramenta sunt. ista rustica verba quae putantur saeculi hominibus, plena sunt sacramentis*).

*David annos natus septuaginta* For the use of the participle *natus* in expressions denoting age, see *OLD* sv *nascor* 6. The biblical account of the elderly monarch’s encounter with the young virgin Abishag (1 Kgs. 1:1–4), on which Jer. bases his paraphrase, does not mention David’s age. Jer. has calculated it to be seventy on the basis of 2 Sam. 5:4, which says that David was thirty when he began his reign and that he ruled for forty years.

*bellicosus quondam vir* The adjective *bellicosus* in this instance does not mean ‘fond of war’ (cf. *OLD* sv *bellicosus* 1a). Jer. is not describing David’s disposition as being that of a war-monger. Rather, *bellicosus* is a reference to the fact that he had in his younger years been actively engaged in warfare (cf. *TLL* II viii.1810.18 ff.). He applies this adjective, in the same sense, to David also at *tract. in Ps.* 96 ll. 2–3 *legimus in Regnorum et in Paralipomenon libris, quoniam David bellicosus vir fuit, et universas gentes in circuitu subiecerit, et in suam redegerit potestatem*.

*senectute frigente* On the chilling effect of old age, see e.g. Cels. *medic.* 2.1; Virg. *Aen.* 5.395–396; Sil. *Pun.* 5.570; Hil. *tract. in Ps.* 118 2.19; Ambr. *exp. Ps.* 118 19.19, *vid.* 2.9; Anon. *cons. Zacc. et Apoll.* 1.18.5; Macrobian. *Saturn.* 7.10.8; Fulg. *mit.* 3.4. For the classical notion (and its early Christian continuation) that old age cools the fire of sexual desire, see e.g. Plat. *rep.* 329b, *symp.* 195b; Cic. *senect.* 47; Hor. *carm.* 2.11.6–7; Juv. *sat.* 10.204–206; Plut. 788e–f; Zen. *tract.* 1.1.5; Jer. *epist.* 117.10.1; Paul. Nol. *carm.* 21.198; Ps.-Nil. *narr.* 2.1; cf. S. Bertman, “The Ashes and the Flame: Passion and Aging in Classical Poetry,” in T. Falkner and J. de Luce (eds.), *Old Age in Greek and Latin Literature* (Albany, 1989), 157–171.

*calefieri ... calefaceret* Jer. emphasizes David's coldness (i.e. by the need for him to be warmed up) by means of this imperfect antistrophe. Hritzu, 22, notes his generally sparing use of perfect antistrophe in which the repetition is unaffected by the kind of inflectional change witnessed here.

*quaeritur* Historical present used for the sake of vividness, to give the search for a consort immediate relevance for the current discussion.

*Abisag* Abishag (1 Kgs. 1:3, 15; 2:17, 21–22) is one of two Shunammite women mentioned in the OT (the other is Elisha's unnamed hostess: 2 Kgs. 4:12, 25, 36—according to *Pirkei d'Rabbi Eliezer*, ch. 33, both women are sisters). W. Schottroff, "Der Zugriff des Königs auf die Töchter," *EvTh* 49 (1989): 268–285, suggests that she may have been one of the unmarried daughters mentioned in 1 Sam. 8:13. According to 1 Kgs. 1:1–4, which forms the basis of Jer.'s discussion, the aged king David was unable to stop shivering no matter how many covers were piled onto him (L. Ben-Noun, "Was the Biblical King David Affected by Hypothermia?," *JGer* ser. A 57 [2002]: 364–367, identifies this as the earliest documented case of hypothermia), and so his attendants suggested that they find a beautiful young maiden to lie beside him and keep him warm, their intention evidently being to arouse him sexually. Following an extensive search of Israelite territory, they found a virgin named Abishag from Shunem, which was located in the northern tribal territory of Issachar in the valley of Jezreel (see Jos. 19:18; 1 Sam. 28:4; 2 Kgs. 4:8), and brought her to David. She attended to him, but the biblical account explicitly states that the two did not have sexual relations, although Abishag was comely (in the *Apocalypse of Sedrach* [7] she is said to have been more beautiful than Eve but only half as attractive as Sarah). Nor did they marry. In the Babylonian Talmud (*Sanh.* 22a) Abishag demands that David take her as his wife so that she can relinquish her ambiguous status as his maiden, but he refuses.

*Sunamitis* Hilberg's *Somanitis* is based on *H*. I have emended it to *Sunamitis*, which is found in *K* (cf. *Sunamites* in *Y*), as this is the form attested not only in the Vulgate but also elsewhere in Jer. (*comm. in Is.* 3.7.14 l. 29, *comm. in Am.* lib. 2, prol. l. 11, *adv. Iov.* 1.24, 26, *epist.* 36.15.4, 121, prol. 2). The same emendation is made at 3.1 and 3.8.

*quae cum rege dormiret et senile corpus calefaceret* The homoioteleutic verbs *dormiret* and *calefaceret* are subjunctives in relative clauses of purpose introduced by *quae* (= *ut ea*). The expression *dormire cum* can be a euphemism for having sexual intercourse; see J.N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual*

*Vocabulary* (Baltimore, 1990), 177–178; P. Pierrugues, *Glossarium eroticum linguae latinae* (Amsterdam, 1965), 186; cf. *TLL* V 1 x.2029.84 ff. But it can also have a non-erotic connotation, as it does here: i.e. to lie beside someone. In his paraphrase Jer. is roughly preserving the wording of the Vulgate (*dormi-atque in sinu tuo et calefaciat dominum nostrum regem*), but he adds *senile corpus* to reiterate his theme of David's frigid old age (cf. *senectute frigente* and *frigidus senex*).

*si occidentem sequaris litteram* Cf. 2 Cor. 3:6b *littera enim occidit spiritus autem vivificat*. Jer. quotes or alludes to this verset on nearly fifty other occasions, and often in a polemical sense, to criticize opponents of allegorical biblical exegesis (cf. Brown 1992, 122). Similarly, here he uses it as a justificatory preface to his own piece of spiritualizing exegesis about the character of Abishag, on which see on 3.7 *ipsius ... ampliore*.

*vel figmentum esse de mimo vel Atellanarum ludicra* At *epist.* 147.5.1 Jer. declares that the deacon Sabinian's seducing of a nun in Paula's convent was so heinous and unspeakable that no mimographer or composer of Atellan farce could adequately describe it (*repertum est facinus, quod nec mimus fingere nec scurra ludere nec Atellanus possit effari*).

*figmentum ... de mimo* Mime (μῖμος, *mimus*), true to its etymological derivation (from μιμεῖσθαι), sought to imitate and poke fun at all aspects of human life, especially vices; cf. Diomedes' definition: *mimus est sermonis cuiuslibet (imitatio et) motus sine reverentia, vel factorum et (dictorum) turpium cum lascivia imitatio* (H. Keil, *Grammatici latini*, vol. 1 [Leipzig, 1850], 491); see also Cic. *orat.* 2.251–252; Sen. *brev. vit.* 12.8. Mime differed from Atellan farce in that it tended on the whole to be more versified and less improvised and its actors did not wear masks (also, women played female roles, unlike in other forms of Roman stage comedy), but both types of drama freely employed lascivious subject matter and a diversity of themes, from religious parody (C. Panayotakis, "Baptism and Crucifixion on the Mimic Stage," *Mnemosyne* 50 [1997]: 302–319) to cuckoldry and adultery (P. Kehoe, "The Adultery Mime Reconsidered," in D.F. Bright and E.S. Ramage [eds.], *Classical Texts and their Traditions* [Chico, 1984], 89–106). In terms of slapstick the mimic repertory was wide-ranging and included song-and-dance numbers, magic tricks, acrobatics, strip teases, and even simulated sex scenes between the actors. For the fragments, see M. Bonaria (ed.), *Romani mimi* (Rome, 1965); what little survives of the Greek mimes in Roman antiquity can be found in H. Wiemken, *Der griechische Mimus*

(Bremen, 1972). For a comprehensive overview of mime, see E. Wüst, "Mimos," *RE* 15.2 (1932): 1727–1764. Jer. would have had ample opportunity to see mime performances, for throughout the late Empire they were put on in public (on stage) and in more intimate settings (e.g. at dinner parties) (cf. R. Webb, *Demons and Dancers: Performance in Late Antiquity* [Cambridge, Mass., 2008], 95–138), and they would continue to be staged publicly until being outlawed by Justinian in 525.

*Atellanarum ludicra* The native Italian farce known as *fabula Atellana* was being staged in the Oscan town of Atella near Naples by the fourth century BC, and probably in or before the late third century BC it migrated to Rome. The *fabulae* were short skits, either scripted or improvised, which presented farcical scenarios about life in the small town and country (this rustic setting is reflected in the known titles of some *Atellanae*: e.g. *Bubulcus*, *Pappus Agricola*, *Verres Aegrotus*, *Vindemiatores*). The best known representatives of the scripted, 'literary' variety which flourished especially under Sulla for a brief time are L. Pomponius and Novius. All that survives of this more elevated form of Atellan farce is 115 titles and about 320 genuine lines, for which see P. Frassinetti (ed.), *Atellanae fabulae* (Rome, 1967). The plots were simple and often involved some kind of trickery or deception, the humor was low-brow and the slapstick buffoonish, and the language was colloquial and could be unabashedly obscene; cf. G. Bonfante, "La lingua delle Atellane e dei mimi," *Maia* 19 (1967): 3–21. Around 100 BC *Atellana* eclipsed more venerable forms of stage theater (i.e. *fabula palliata* and *fabula togata*) to become the preferred brand of theatrical performance in Rome, but its heyday was shortlived. Evidently by the middle of the first century BC it had been all but supplanted on the Roman stage by mime (see previous n.), which had come to Rome from Sicily in the third century BC. By Jer.'s lifetime Atellan farce had long since disappeared from the public stage, and so his awareness of its farcical nature (and thus its similarity to mime in this respect) must have come from some other source besides live performance, such as the numerous references to *Atellana* in Roman literature (e.g. Liv. *a.u.c.* 7.2.12; Cic. *divin.* 2.25; Varr. *ling. lat.* 7.3.29, 7.5.84; Petron. *sat.* 53.13, 68.5; Juv. *sat.* 6.71). For the history and theatrical conventions of Atellan farce, see R. Rieks, "Mimus und Atellanae," in E. Lefèvre (ed.), *Das römische Drama* (Darmstadt, 1978), 348–377.

*frigidus senex obvolvitur vestimentis et nisi complexu adolescentulae non tepescit* Now Jer. illustrates, by means of this reductionist plot-summary which echoes 1 Kgs. 1:1b (*cumque operiretur vestibis non calefiebat*), what he

means when he says that the Abishag episode, if understood literally, has the element of farcical unrealism that is characteristic of mime and *fabula Atellaniana* (Chrysostom similarly addresses the seeming absurdity of why John the Baptist had to send messengers to inquire into Christ's nascent public ministry when the facts should already have been known to him; *hom. in Mt.* 36.1 [PG 57:413]). If the story is read through this theatrical lens, the elderly king David may be implied to be a stock character along the lines of the doddery old man of Atellan farce (e.g. Pappus) and perhaps also the lecherous *senex amans* of classical Roman comedy who resorts to laughable ploys to win the love of a young woman; see G. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton, 1952), 165–167, 245–247; cf. J.M. Cody, “The *senex amator* in Plautus’ *Casina*,” *Hermes* 104 (1976): 453–476; W. Suder, “Homme âgé de soixante ans ... qu’il court les filles: quelques remarques sur la vieillesse et la morale sexuelle chez Plaute,” in *Le monde romain et ses périphéries sous la république et sous l’empire* (Wrocław, 2001), 153–161. The mimic *senex*, a stock character much derided for lacking foresight and being easily deceived (cf. Varr. *Menipp.* fr. 51 Astbury; Cic. *amic.* 99–100), does not seem as comfortable a fit.

## 2.2

*vivebat adhuc Bersabee, supererat Abigea et reliquae uxores* David had eight wives in all: Ahinoam (1 Sam. 25:43), Michal (1 Sam. 18:20–27), Maachah (1 Chron. 3:2), Haggith (1 Chron. 3:2), Abital (2 Sam. 3:4), Eglah (2 Sam. 3:4), Abigail (1 Sam. 25:42), and Bathsheba (2 Sam. 11:27), the mother of Solomon (1 Kgs. 1:11). On their portrayal in the OT, see A. Berlin, “Characterization in Biblical Narrative: David’s Wives,” *JSOT* 23 (1982): 69–85.

*Bersabee* This spelling of Bathsheba's name is based on the Greek form Βηρσαβее (LXX).

*concubinae* David had ten concubines (2 Sam. 15:16, 20:3). At *epist.* 123.13.1 Jer. imprecisely notes the “many” consorts he had.

*omnes quasi frigidae repudiantur, et in unius tantum grandaevus calescit amplexibus* Jer. underscores the apparent illogicality of this scenario by restricting *unius* further by the adverbial *tantum*. Hilberg has *repudiantur, in unius ...*, but on the authority of e.g. *P, Σ, D, k*, and *B I* I have restored the copulative *et* so as to eliminate the run-on sentence, which would seem awkward in a work of otherwise exceptional stylistic polish.



*Abraham multo David senior fuit* *David* here is in the ablative (denoting degree of difference). In Jer., as in most Latin patristic authors, this Hebrew proper name is always indeclinable (cf. *TLL* III 1.60.43 ff.), but a few treat it as a third-declension noun, hence the gen. *Davidis* (e.g. Iuv. *evang. lib. IV* 1.121, 3.356) and abl. *Davide* (Mar. Vict. *adv. Ar.* 2.5).

*vivente Sarra aliam non quaesivit uxorem* Jer. is technically correct in that, as far as the OT narrative is concerned, Abraham evidently did not actively 'seek' (*quaesivit*) another wife while Sarah was still alive (after she had died he took another wife, Keturah, who bore him six sons; Gen. 25:1–2), but nevertheless she did give her slave-girl Hagar to him as a wife after she had failed repeatedly to conceive (Gen. 16:3 *tulit Agar Aegyptiam ancillam suam ... et dedit eam viro suo uxorem*), and Hagar gave birth to Ishmael when he was eighty-six years old (Gen. 16:15–16). Despite his translation of *uxorem* for Vulg. Gen. 16:3, Jer. seems to have regarded Hagar only as Abraham's concubine (so *tract. in Ps.* 127 ll. 123–124 *sanctus Abraham habuit uxorem Sarram, habuit Agar concubinam*).

*Isaac duplices David annos habuit et cum Rebecca iam vetula numquam refrixit* Isaac was forty when he married Rebecca (Gen. 25:20), sixty when Jacob and Esau were born (Gen. 25:26), and 180 when he died (Gen. 35:28). Jer. implies here that he was around 140 (i.e. David was seventy when he met Abishag; see above on *David annos natus septuaginta*), but the OT does not give this numerical figure, nor does it specify at what age Rebecca died (some commentators infer her death from Gen. 35:27), and it likewise is silent about whether Isaac desired a woman other than his wife in his old age (cf. Plut. 789b, who says that a man married to his wife for a long time who takes a paramour has reached the *σκαιότης ὑπερβολή*).

*taceo de prioribus ante diluvium viris* Another instance of *praeteritio* is given at 3.5 (*taceo ceteros philosophos*). If we are to judge by the occurrences elsewhere in his works, Jer. had a slight preference for the form *tacere de* over *tacere* + acc.

*qui post annos nongentos ... nequaquam puellares quaesiere complexus* Six antediluvian patriarchs are said to have reached their nine hundredth year: Adam (930), Seth (912), Enosh (905), Kenan (910), Jared (962), and Methusaleh (969); see Gen. 5:5, 8, 11, 14, 20, 27. Jer.'s confident (i.e. *nequaquam*) assertion that none of these men, each of whom became fathers and thus had engaged in sexual intercourse, did not in their decrepit old age seek

the embraces of concubines is not warranted from the minimalist genealogy given in Gen. 5:3–27, but this groundless claim nonetheless furthers his present argument, and it also may be related to his contemporaneous controversy with Jovinian. Jovinian had cited the antediluvian patriarchs as positive examples of the inherent goodness of marriage and procreation, but Jer. mocked his invocation of them as being inconsequential (*adv. Iov.* 1.5 *quasi generationis ordo et historia conditionis humanae sine coniugibus et liberis potuerit enarrari*). Here, in the letter to Nepotian, Jer. neglects to mention that they were married (perhaps a deliberately tacit refusal even to concede Jovinian's point) and stresses only that they were paragons of chastity and that by implication they embodied the ascetic sexual ethic that he championed in *Adversus Iovinianum*, which he composed at roughly the same time as the letter to Nepotian. Additionally, Jer.'s allusion to their longevity is perhaps what prompted him to mention it again not longer thereafter, in his epistolary epitaph on Nepotian (*epist.* 60.14.3 *nam si nongentos vitae excederemus annos, ut ante diluvium vivebat humanum genus ...*).

*non dico senilibus sed paene iam cariosis artubus* On *cariosa senectus*, see Lucil. 1062; Ov. *am.* 1.12.29; Phaedr. *fab.* 5.10.5; Prudent. *cath.* 10.141; Aug. *c. Iul.* lib. 6 p. 842; Vict. Vit. *hist. pers.* 1.26.

*certe Moyses dux Israhelitici populi centum viginti annos habebat et Sephoram non mutavit* Jer. assertively (i.e. *certe*) but nevertheless (on the basis of the biblical record, that is) ineffectually contends, for the sake of his argument, that yet another OT figure, Moses, whose prominence he notes with the epithet *dux Israhelitici populi* and who lived to be 120 (Dt. 34:7), did not in all of his days, much less in his old age, find physical gratification in any woman other than his wife Zipporah, who is mentioned at Ex. 2:16–22 and 18:1–6. However, according to Num. 12:1, Moses also married an unnamed Cushite woman.

### Chapter 3

In the previous chapter Jer. eschewed interpreting the David-Abishag story literally, and in the present chapter he proposes an alternative, allegorical reading which is compatible with his ascetic biblical hermeneutic and worldview: the figure of Abishag who enfolds the king in her warm embrace is not a real woman but divine Wisdom. In support of this interpretation, which he probably obtained from Origen, Jer. explores a rather creative but nonetheless implausible Hebrew etymology of the name 'Abishag'. In the greater part of the chapter he complements these exegetical findings with a discussion of how wisdom grows ever stronger in those who have cultivated it assiduously throughout a lifetime and into their twilight years. As cases in point he cites a number of prominent figures from classical antiquity who continued to make impressive literary or philosophical contributions after reaching an advanced age. In compiling his twin catalogues of famous poets and philosophers Jer. has relied very heavily upon Cicero's dialogue *Cato maior de senectute* (on its posthumous influence, see P. Wuilleumier, "L'influence du *Cato maior*," in *Mélanges A. Ernout* [Paris, 1940], 383–388), yet from his manner of appropriating material it is clear that he has tried to disguise his literary dependence so as to give the impression that he has retrieved this information from his own vast mental storehouse of *classica* and not from a lone writing.

#### 3.1–2

*igitur* 'So then', introducing formal discussion of the topic just proposed (cf. *OLD* sv *igitur* 4), i.e. *quaeritur itaque puella de universis finibus Israhel, Abisag Sunamitis, quae cum rege dormiret et senile corpus calefaceret* (2.1).

*tam fervens ut frigidum calefaceret, tam sancta ut calentem ad libidinem non provocaret?* The question, framed as a paradox which plays on ancient conceptions of sexual passion as 'heat' (cf. on 2.1 *senectute frigente*), is made especially pointed and brought to a vivid close by these two clauses which are studded with an array of rhetorical figures—perfect parison, homoioteleuton (-ret ... -ret), antithesis (*fervens ... frigidum; sancta ... ad libidinem non provocaret*), anaphora (*tam ... tam*), alliteration (*fervens ... frigidum*), asyndeton, and paronomasia (*calefaceret ... calentem*). The second clause reveals Jer.'s discomfort with even the possibility that David could have been tempted by Abishag's presence, which moves one step beyond the biblical narrative's insistence that he did not engage in sexual relations with her

(1 Kgs. 1:4 *rex vero non cognovit eam* = והמלך לא ידעה). His ascetic sensibilities, which profoundly shaped his biblical hermeneutic (on which, see Clark, *passim*), thus have prompted him to allegorize Abishag.

*exponat sapientissimus Salomon patris sui delicias et pacificus bellatoris viri narret amplexus* The hyperbatic displacement of *amplexus* from *bellatoris viri* is Jer.'s way of emphasizing David's 'embraces' (*amplexus* here looks back to 2.2 *in unius tantum grandaevus calescit amplexibus*) as being the operative word encapsulating the apparent interpretive problem that he has just posed, in the immediately preceding sentence, as a question. *delicias* and *amplexus* are advisedly chosen by Jer.: they look forward to *amplexabitur* and *deliciarum* in the sequent quotation from Proverbs.

*sapientissimus* This superlative adjective is an extremely common descriptor for Solomon among the Latin Fathers (e.g. Lact. *div. inst.* 4.6.6; Aug. *civ. dei* 20.3; John Cass. *coll.* 16.8). Cf. σοφώτατος (e.g. Eus. *dem. evang.* 4.16.60, 5.1.5; *praep. evang.* 11.4.6) and πάνσοφος (e.g. Didym. *comm. in Zach.* 4.241). The title *sapientissimus Salomon* has the added benefit here of its sibilant alliteration (i.e. both initial-sequent and initial-interior).

*pacificus bellatoris* Jer.'s juxtaposition of these two words results in an arresting antithesis: these words capture the general character of each man's reign as king as well as the etymology of each's proper name; cf. e.g. *Salomon pacificus* (*hebr. nom.* p. 71 Lagarde, *epist.* 46.3.4) and *David fortis manu* (*hebr. nom.* p. 35 Lagarde). For a similar opposition, cf. Eucher. *inst. ad Sal.* 2 *sicut David ... fortissimus omnibus fere bellis extitit, Salomon pacificus utique in pace regnum administravit.*

*bellatoris viri* The apposition of these two nouns to mean e.g. 'warrior' is rather common (cf. Sil. *Pun.* 1.218; Flor. *epit. Tit. Liv.* 1.8.4; Ambr. *epist. ex. coll.* 14.29; Ruf. *ben. patr.* 2.25; Oros. *c. Pel.* 24.2), and in Jer. alone it recurs some sixteen other times. On David as a man of war in his youth, see on 2.1 *bellicosus quondam vir.*

"posside sapientiam ... protegat te" Prov. 4:5–9. In its original context this biblical text is presented as the grandfather's discourse to his grandson in which Lady Wisdom is pictured as a bride to be wooed and loved and also as a patroness who rewards her lover for his persistence; see B. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1–15* (Grand Rapids, 2004), 278–283. At *comm. in Am.* lib. 2, prol. ll. 34–38 Jer. quotes a snippet of this lengthy passage in the

course of begging for *sapientia* for himself as he continues his exegesis of the Minor Prophets. In this very same prologue he also revisits themes explored in this initial section of *Epistula* 52 (see on 2.1 *Sunamitis*, 3.1–2 *omnes ... ceterae*, 3.7 *sed ... ampliolem*).

*omnes paene virtutes corporis mutantur in senibus et increcente sola sapientia decrescunt ceterae* By *mutantur* Jer. means change for the worse (cf. *OLD* sv *muto* 9a). The general enfeeblement of the body's faculties is a commonplace observation made in Latin literature; see e.g. Plaut. *Men.* 756–758 *consitus sum / senectute, onustum gero corpus, vires reliquere*; Cic. *senect.* 34–35; cf. T. Parkin, *Old Age in the Roman World* (Baltimore, 2003), 57–89. It recurs in Greek literature as well; see e.g. Greg. Nys. *epist.* 17.2 πολλή δὲ καὶ ἡ τοῦ σώματος σαθρότης, ὡς εἰκὸς προϊόντι τῷ χρόνῳ συνεπιδιδούσα; *apoph. patr.* Aio 1 (PG 65:136) (the aged monk Antianos had been extremely active as a worker of good deeds in his youth but in old age he was blind, perpetually sick, and bedridden). There were of course exceptions. For instance, of the sophist Gorgias of Leontini it is said that by the time he died at the age of 108 he had the body and mind of a young man (Philostr. v. *soph.* 1.9); a similar claim is advanced about the Neopythagorean philosopher Apollonius of Tyana (Philostr. v. *Apoll.* 8.29). At the time of his death at the age of 120, Moses still had crisp vision and undiminished strength (Dt. 34:7); St. Antony, like Moses, had perfect vision (Athan. v. *Ant.* 93.2). According to Theodoret, the Syrian hermit Zebinas, upon reaching extreme old age, continued to perform the same ascetic austerities that he had performed in his youth (*hist. rel.* 24.1), and another monk, Antoninus, despite being very old, was able to pray and work all day and all night without his body breaking down (*hist. rel.* 23.2).

The notion expressed by Jer. concerning the proportionate increase of wisdom in relation to the diminution of bodily faculties is applied by Chrysostom to elderly devout Christians: ἀσθενὴς αὐτῶν ἡ φύσις, ἀλλὰ δυνατὴ ἡ ἀλείψασα αὐτοὺς χάρις· παραλέλνται τὰ σώματα τῷ γήρῳ, ἀλλὰ συγκεκρότηται τὰ φρονήματα τῷ πόθῳ τῆς εὐσεβείας (*hom. 1 in Macc.* [PG 50:619]); cf. Bas. *epist.* 46.2 γηραλέας ἐν Χριστῷ μάμμης νεαζούσης ἄρτι καὶ ἀκμαζούσης τὴν ἀρετὴν; Greg. Naz. *orat.* 7.2 τοὺς σεμνοὺς τοῦσδε λέγω καὶ πολιούς, καὶ οὐχ ἦττον δι' ἀρετὴν αἰδεσίμους ἢ διὰ γήραος· ὦν τὰ μὲν σώματα χρόνῳ κέκμηκεν, αἱ ψυχαὶ δὲ Θεῷ νεάζουσι; Aug. *civ. dei* 1.18; see further C. Gnllka, “Kalóghros: die Idee des ‘guten Alters’ bei den Christen,” *JbAC* 23 (1980): 5–21; R. Greer, “Special Gift and Special Burden: Views of Old Age in the Early Church,” in S. Hauerwas et al. (eds.), *Growing Old in Christ* (Grand Rapids, 2003), 19–37 (26–31). For the positive impact of aging on one's level of wisdom,

see e.g. Cic. *Tusc. disp.* 1.94 *nihil enim est profecto homini prudentia dulcius, quam, ut cetera auferat, adfert certe senectus*; Philo *somn.* 1.11 ἀνθεὶ γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ πρὸς ἐπιστήμην, ὁπότε αἱ τοῦ σώματος ἄκμαί χρόνου μήκει μαραίνονται; Plut. 789d; Philostr. *v. soph.* 1.25 γηράσκουσα γὰρ ἦδε ἡ ἐπιστήμη σοφίαν ἀρτύνει; Clem. Alex. *paed.* 3.3.18.3 φρόνησις δὲ καὶ ἀκριβεῖς λογισμοὶ πολλοὶ συνέσει συνακμάζουσι τῷ χρόνῳ, καὶ τὸ γήρας ἐνισχύουσι τῷ τόνῳ τῆς πολυπειρίας, ἄνθος ἀξιέραστον φρονήσεως σεμνῆς εἰς πίστιν εὐλογον προτείνοντες <τὴν> πολιάν; cf. also Plato's view that one can only become a true philosopher in old age (see J. Clota, "Platón y la vejez," *Helmantica* 5 [1954]: 61–69). See also Jer. *comm. in Am.* lib. 2, prol. ll. 8–11 *senectus multa se cum et bona affert et mala. bona, quia nos ab impudentissimis liberat dominis voluptatibus, gulae imponit modum, libidinis frangit impetus, auget sapientiam, dat maturiora consilia*. Yet in general ancient writers recognized that wisdom does not come automatically with age (see e.g. Ambr. *vid.* 2.9; Aug. *adnot. in Iob* 34) but has to be cultivated with philosophical or religious principles.

A related theme is the spiritually rejuvenating effects of virtuous living on old age: cf. Aug. *enarr. in Ps.* 91 11 *qui bene senescit ordine suo, quaeris illi aliquando in capite capillum nigrum, et non inuenis; sic cum fuerit vita nostra talis, ut quaeratur nigritudo peccatorum, et non inveniatur; senecta ista iuuenilis est, senecta ista viridis est, semper virebit*, *ibid.* 112 2 *sit senectus vestra puerilis et pueritia senilis*.

This entire Hieronymian passage (*omnes ... ceterae*) is quoted authoritatively by the compiler of the *Freising Florilegium* (CCSL 108D:11).

*increscente ... decrescunt* Jer. is partial to the paronomasiac *crescere-decrescere*, which he often uses to express the transience of the human condition (e.g. *tract. in Ps.* 143 ll. 56–65, *adv. Iov.* 2.11, *epist.* 78.19.2, 108.25.2).

*ieiunia, chameuniae, huc illucque discursus, peregrinorum susceptio, defensio pauperum, standi in oratione perseverantia, visitatio languentium, labor manuum unde praebeantur elemosynae* This striking sevenfold asyndeton, which is punctuated by homoioprotic chiasmus (*peregrinorum susceptio, defensio pauperum*), not only maintains an energetic tempo through rapid utterance and thereby makes Jer.'s collective portrait of monastic virtues seem more vivid, but it also reinforces the impression that there is a great amount of items being enumerated.

*ieiunia* According to Celsus (1.3.32), the middle-aged can tolerate abstinence from food better than the young. However, ascetic Christian authors uniformly conceded that advancing age diminishes the body's capacity to

sustain the austerity in fasting that it could in youth; see e.g. *apoph. patr. Syncletica* 15 (PG 65:427) νέος ὢν καὶ ὑγιῆς νήστευσον· ἥξει γὰρ τὸ γῆρας μετὰ ἀσθενείας; John Chrys. *hom. 7 in Hebr.* (PG 63:64); Anon. *hist. mon.* 1.17; John Cass. *inst.* 5.5. Jer., fully aware of these limitations, nonetheless lauds Paula for having been able to put to shame her younger nuns in Bethlehem by her extraordinary dietary self-discipline (*epist.* 108.21.1).

*chameuniae* Jer. appears to be the only Latin patristic author to use the word *chameunia* (χαμευνία: χαμαί + εὐνή) in its ascetic sense of sleeping on the bare ground. It recurs four other times in his works: *comm. in Hiez.* 12.41 l. 1344 (not registered by *TLL* III 5.990.10 ff.), *comm. in Am.* 3.13–15 l. 388, *comm. in Agg.* 1.11 l. 438 (here he glosses the word as *humi dormitiones*), and *tract. in Ps.* 106 ll. 131–132. In Jer. it is always listed alongside fasting as a core bodily discipline, as it usually is also by Chrysostom (*sacerd.* 3.12, 6.5, *hom. in Mt.* 77.5 [PG 58:700]) and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (*hist. rel.*, prol. 5, 1.7, 10.2). In a saying attributed to Amma Syncletica it likewise is paired with fasting as a means to quell carnal desires (ἡ νηστεία καὶ ἡ χαμευνία διὰ τὰς ἡδονὰς ἡμῖν νενομοθέτηται [PG 65:424]). This common ascetic practice is mentioned also at e.g. Athan. *v. Ant.* 4.1; Greg. Naz. *orat.* 8.13, 24.13, 43.61, 44.9; John Chrys. *virg.* 9; Geront. *v. Mel.*, prol.; Soz. *hist. eccl.* 1.12.10; Anon. *v. Dan. Styl.* 4.

*huc illucque discursus* The expression *huc illucque discurre* (or *discursus*) appears more than twenty times in Jer. At *epist.* 66.13.2 he employs it in the context of describing how Paula and Eustochium constantly busied themselves with housekeeping chores and service to their fellow nuns in Bethlehem. In the present instance *huc illucque discursus* has the same sense of the monk remaining physically active in his service to other Christians (see Vogüé, 2.356), which, like fasting, sleeping on the ground, and the other items on Jer.'s list, becomes increasingly difficult as the body ages. Impaired mobility is one of the stereotypical symptoms of old age mentioned in the literary sources (e.g. Plaut. *Poen.* 507–510, *Pseud.* 659; Sen. *Herc. fur.* 849–850; Jer. *tract. in Ps.* 143 ll. 62–63). Related signs of waning coordination in the elderly include tottering limbs (Plaut. *Men.* 854; Ov. *met.* 13.533–534) and a tremulous voice (Hor. *carm.* 4.13.5; Ov. *fast.* 6.415–416).

*peregrinorum susceptio* In the primitive church hospitality practiced by Christians greatly facilitated the transmission of oral traditions about Jesus' life and teachings which later become codified, in written form, in the Gospels; see D. Riddle, "Early Christian Hospitality," *JBL* 57 (1938): 141–154. With the rise of Christian monasticism the providing of hospitality, espe-

cially when it involved hosting travel-weary strangers, became an important expression of Christian charity; see R. Greer, "Hospitality in the First Five Centuries of the Church," *MonStud* 10 (1974): 29–48; H. Waddell, *The Desert Fathers* (Ann Arbor, 1957), 113–114 (on the reception of guests in eastern monastic culture, see e.g. Athan. *v. Ant.* 17.7, 67.1; Anon. *hist. mon.* 1.62, 8.55–56; John Cass. *coll.* 1.12).

*defensio pauperum* *pauperes* is the generic Latin word for 'the poor' (Grodzynski, 160–168). Its meaning is elastic, and it theoretically can refer to everyone from the working poor who have just enough money to scrape by (cf. πένης) to the truly destitute who live in abject poverty (cf. πτωχός); for its lexical range, see *TLL* X 1 vi.842.58 ff.; R. Finn, "Portraying the Poor: Descriptions of Poverty in Christian Texts from the Late Roman Empire," in M. Atkins and R. Osborne (eds.), *Poverty in the Roman World* (Cambridge, 2006), 130–144 (135–137). Here it presumably is inclusive of all who belong to the ranks of the poor. *defensio* of these marginalized figures by Christian clerical and lay benefactors entailed everything from interceding on their behalf to creditors and secular authorities (Aug. *epist.* 151.2, 153; John Cass. *coll.* 14.4; Bes. *v. Shen.* 81–82; Jul. Pom. *v. cont.* 1.25.1; cf. Athan. *v. Ant.* 84.3–7; Ambr. *off.* 2.70–71) to providing them with money with which to pay down their debts (Ambr. *off.* 1.148; cf. Jer. *epist.* 60.10.5); see further Gryson, 297–301. On the tendency of bishops in Late Antiquity to act as mediators between Christians and the secular government, see L. Cracco Ruggini, "Vir sanctus: il vescovo e il suo pubblico ufficio sacro nella città," in É. Rebillard and C. Sotinel (eds.), *L'évêque dans la cité du IV<sup>e</sup> au V<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Rome, 1998), 3–15.

*standi in oratione perseverantia* Standing was a common posture for prayer in early Christianity (Mk. 11:25); see G. Bunge, *Earthen Vessels* (San Francisco, 2002), 141–143. Standing for prolonged periods while praying, a widely attested practice in early monastic culture (e.g. Anon. *hist. mon.* 13.4, 20.7), became more difficult for monks as their joints weakened with age (see e.g. Theod. *hist. rel.* 4.12, 17.2, 24.1) and could have a detrimental impact on one's health, as is illustrated by the case of John the Hermit, whose feet eventually became swollen, infected, and pus-filled (Anon. *hist. mon.* 13.7). Symeon the Stylite likewise developed on his left foot a malignant ulcer from which pus oozed (Theod. *hist. rel.* 26.23). According to the *Life of Pachomius* (SBo 19), Pachomius and his brother John would stand all night while they prayed, and this caused their feet to become painfully swollen. Cf. a saying attributed to Abba Bessarion: τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη οὐκ ἔθικα ἑαυτὸν ἐπιπλευρὸν,



ἀλλὰ καθήμενος ἢ στήκων ἐκοιμήμην (PG 65:141). On the early Christian adoption of the word *oratio* for ‘prayer’, see E. Löfstedt, *Syntactia: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins* (2 vols., Lund, 1956), 2.463–464.

In the early church kneeling (Acts 20:36) was common as well, though by the late second century it evidently had become forbidden on Sundays and during the Easter season (P. Bradshaw, *Daily Prayer in the Early Church* [Oxford, 1982], 64–65), because the act of standing upright while in prayer was thought to symbolize the Lord’s resurrection.

*visitatio languentium* See on 15.1 *visitare languentes*.

*labor manuum unde praebeantur elemosynae* The phrase *labor manuum*, with its monastic connotation (cf. P. Bonnerue, “*Opus et labor dans les règles monastiques anciennes*,” *StudMon* 35 [1993]: 265–291), indicates that Jer. is describing the activities of monastic Christians, be they monastic clergymen or full-fledged monks. In the late antique East and West it was a common practice for monks to use revenue from manual labor to support their almsgiving. See e.g. Anon. v. *Pach.* SBo 19; *apoph. patr.* Agathon 27 (PG 65:116); Bas. *reg. fus. tract.* 42 (PG 31:1025) σκοπὸς οὖν ἐκάστῳ προκεῖσθαι ὀφείλει ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ ἢ ὑπηρεσία τῶν δεομένων, οὐχὶ ἡ ἰδία αὐτοῦ χρεία; John Chrys. *hom. in Mt.* 68.3 (PG 58:644), *adv. oppug. v. mon.* p. 364 (PG 47); John Cass. *inst.* 5.38, 10.22; Anon. v. *Alex. Acem.* 27 (PO 6:678); Cyr. Scyth. v. *Euth.* p. 14 Schwartz; cf. Finn, 90–96. As a case in point, the eighty-year-old Galatian monk Philodoromos earned his daily bread as a scribe and donated the surplus of his earnings, totalling 250 *solidi*, to the poor (Pall. *hist. Laus.* 45.3). The anonymous author of the Greek *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* (18.1) tells of a priest named Sarapion who lived in the Egyptian district of Arsinoë and oversaw a community of about ten thousand monks who, at harvest time, would pool their grain, which provided relief for the needy both locally and at Alexandria.

The feminine noun *ele(e)mosyna* is a Christian loan-word from Greek (ἐλεημοσύνη). In classical Greek the adjective ἐλεεινός means showing pity or sympathy (LSJ, 531). In the NT ἐλεημοσύνη is used only in the sense of ‘benevolent activity’ directed at the poor, i.e. almsgiving (see e.g. Mt. 6:2–4; Lk. 11:41; Acts 3:2–3; cf. *TDNT* 2.485–487), and this is its primary meaning in patristic Greek literature (Danker, 315–316; Lampe, 447–448). Unlike other words in the Greek NT that were assigned a pre-existing equivalent in Latin (e.g. τὸ ἔλεος = *misericordia*), ἐλεημοσύνη was simply transliterated and kept its same original meaning of ‘almsgiving’ (see Pétré, 222–239). As to the reason for this, Burton, 146, suggests that, “the institution of alms-giving

seems to have been so integral to the Christian community that the word could not be supplanted”.

*ne sermonem longius traham* I.e. he *could* elongate his list of duties but he chooses not to do so because he is wary of boring his reader (cf. *epist.* 125.15.2 *ne plura replicando fastidium legenti faciam*). Jer., evidently more so than any other ancient Latin writer, had a marked preference for the negative purpose clause *ne longius traham* + obj. (cf. Sen. *ben.* 7.13.1 *ne traham longius*, for the intransitive use of *trahere*) to express a limiting sense. See *tract. in Ps.* 11 l. 37 *ne longius trahatur oratio*, *adv. Iov.* 1.1 *ne lectorem longius traham*, *epist.* 29.4.5 *ne te longius traham*, 77.8.4 *ne sermonem longius traham*, 107.10.1 *ne gulae praecepta longius traham*. For slight variations, cf. *comm. in Is.* 2.22 l. 40 *ne longum funem traham*, 17.60.13–14 l. 32 *ne longo sermone sensum traham*.

*cuncta quae per corpus exercentur, fracto corpore minora fiunt* Cf. John Chrys. *hom. in Mt.* 55.6 (PG 58:548) ἢ τε γὰρ πρώτη ἡλικία πολλῆς γέμει τῆς ἀνοίας· ἡ δὲ πρὸς τὸ γῆρας ὀδεύουσα πάλιν, πᾶσαν τὴν ἐν ἡμῖν αἴσθησιν καταμαραίνει; *hom. 7 in Hebr.* (PG 63:64) ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὸν σωματικὸν τοῦτον τρέχων δρόμον, εἰκότως, ἐπειδὴν ἡ πολιὰ καταλάβῃ, οὐκέτι ὁμοίως τρέχειν δύναται· ἐν γὰρ τῷ σώματι τὸ πᾶν τοῦ ἀγώνος ἐστί; cf. Cokayne, 53–56.

### 3.3

*nec hoc dico quod in ... his ... qui ... scientiam consecuti sunt, frigeat sapientia* In Greco-Roman antiquity the young were believed to be prone to carnal vices (cf. 1.1 *primos impetus lascivientis aetatis*), impulsive, and lacking the prudence which comes with age and life experience (cf. Cic. *senect.* 20 *temeritas est videlicet florentis aetatis, prudentia senescentis*; see also Greg. Naz. *orat.* 2.72; John Chrys. *hom. in Mt.* 10.1 [PG 57:185]); for the conventional antithesis between rashness in the young and wisdom in the old, see e.g. Hom. *Il.* 3.108–110; Eur. *Phoen.* 528–531. Jer. exempts godly young men from criticism for this behavior because they make a concerted effort to temper it with devout living (*vitae sanctimonia*) and assiduous prayer (*orationis ad deum frequentia*); cf. Ambr. *epist. ex. coll.* 14.26 *quid autem pulchrius abstinentia, quae facit etiam iuventutis annos senescere ut fiat morum senectus?*

*nec* In general, Jer. much prefers *nec* to *neque* (Gillis, 18), and this preference is reflected in his usage in the letter to Nepotian, in which *nec* appears twenty-two times and *neque* only six, even though the latter is the more literary of the two (cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, 451–452).

*adhuc solidioris aetatis* I.e. those for whom the decrepitude of old age has yet to set in; cf. Ambr. *exp. Ps. 118* 18.31 *dum aetas viget, dum vires solidae ... dum ignoratur debilitas*. At *comm. in Math.* 19.30 l. 978 Jer. describes the period immediately preceding *senectus* as the *matura aetas*.

*orationis ad deum frequentia* *orationis frequentia* = *oratione frequenti* (cf. Jer. *tract. in Ps.* 106 l. 151 *animae ardorem oratio frequens extinguit*). Jer. employs the *genitivus inversus*, nominalizing the implied adjective *frequenti* so as to accentuate the frequency of the prayer of dedicated monks. On the prevalence of this construction in late Latin literature, see e.g. U. Hahner, *Cassiodors Psalmenkommentar* (Munich, 1973), 244–261; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, 152.

Jer. praises ceaseless prayer in his *discipulae*, e.g. Paula (*epist.* 108.15.3 *quae iugibus paene orationibus dies noctesque iungebat*) and Asella (*epist.* 24.5.1), who knelt in prayer so often that she acquired knees became hardened like those of a camel.

*sapientia, quae in plerisque senibus aetate marcescit* A possible verbal reminiscence of Wis. 6:13a Vulg. *clara est et quae numquam marcescat sapientia*. Cf. *hom. 7 in Hebr.* (PG 63:65), where Chrysostom satirizes the old man who lacks wisdom; see also Plut. 784a; John Cass. *coll.* 2.13.

*quod adulescentia multa corporis bella sustineat et inter incentiva vitiorum et carnis titillationes* The youth's struggle with sensuality and other forms of temptation, to which Jer. has already alluded (1.1 *primos impetus lascivientis aetatis*), is a commonplace of patristic literature; see e.g. Greg. Naz. *orat.* 15.12; John Chrys. *hom. in Mt.* 82.5 (PG 58:737); Theod. *interpr. in Ps.* p. 1824 (PG 80) εὐρίπιστος ἡ νεότης, καὶ πρὸς κακίαν ὀξύρροπος. διαφόροις γὰρ παθημάτων περικλύζεται κύμασι. On the need to confront the vices of youth with the wisdom of mature years, see John Damasc. *sacr. par.* (PG 96:188) νέος τις ἐστὶν ἔτι; κατὰ τῶν παθῶν ἀνδριζέσθω, καὶ τοσοῦτον ἀπολαυέτω τῆς νεότητος, τὸ μὴ τὰ νέων παθεῖν, ἀλλὰ δὴ πρεσβυτικὴν φρόνησιν ἐν ἀκμαίῳ τῷ σώματι ἐξασκείτω.

The collocation *incentiva vitiorum* recurs nearly two dozen other times in Jer., but outside his literary corpus it is rare (cf. e.g. Ambr. *Hel. et ieiun.* 5.14, *parad.* 6.34; Paul. Nol. *epist.* 39.6; John Cass. *inst.* 6.4.2). Here it forms part of a stylish chiasmus (*inter incentiva vitiorum et carnis titillationes*).

*quasi ignis in lignis viridibus suffocetur* This sequence with its parechetic wordplay (*ignis ... lignis*) has been inspired by Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.45 *ignem ex lignis viridibus atque umidis in loco angusto fieri iussit* (when the magistrate of

Sicyon refused to pay him, Verres shut him up in a small room and lit a fire with damp, unseasoned wood which almost choked the magistrate to death). Hilberg printed *viridioribus*, the reading found in *K*, and rejected *viridibus*, which is attested in the rest of the MSS he consulted. However, in view principally of Jer.'s appropriation of Ciceronian phraseology here, *viridibus* should be restored.

Chrysostom employs strikingly similar imagery to capture the impact of worldly desires on the soul: οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτω λυπεῖ ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμὸν καὶ θολοῖ, ὥς ὁ τῶν βιωτικῶν φροντίδων ὄχλος, καὶ ὁ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἔσμός· ταῦτα γὰρ τοῦ καπνοῦ τούτου τὰ ξύλα. καὶ καθάπερ τὸ πῦρ, ὅταν ὑγρὰς καὶ διαβρόχου τινὸς ἐπιλάβηται ὕλης, πολὺν ἀνάπτει τὸν καπνόν· οὕτω καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία ἡ σφοδρὰ αὐτῇ καὶ φλογώδης, ὅταν ὑγρὰς τινος καὶ διαλελυμένης ἐπιλάβηται ψυχῆς, πολὺν καὶ αὐτὴ τίκτει τὸν καπνόν (*hom. in Mt.* 2.5 [PG 57:29]); cf. Greg. Naz. *orat.* 2.12 δύσληπτον μὲν τὸ ἀγαθὸν τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ φύσει, ὥσπερ καὶ πῦρ ὕλῃ τῇ ὑγροτέρᾳ.

### 3.4

*senectus ... metit* This passage most immediately recalls Cic. *senect.* 9: *aptissima omnino sunt ... arma senectutis artes exercitationesque virtutum, quae in omni aetate cultae, cum diu multumque vixeris, mirificos eceferunt fructus, non solum quia numquam deserunt, ne extremo quidem tempore aetatis, quamquam id quidem maximum est, verum etiam quia conscientia bene actae vitae multorumque benefactorum recordatio iucundissima est*; cf. *ibid.* 62 *non cani nec rugae repente auctoritatem arripere possunt, sed honeste acta superior aetas fructus capit auctoritatis extremos*. For a similar idea, cf. Sir. 6:18–19 τέκνον, ἐκ νεότητός σου ἐπίλεξαι παιδείαν, καὶ ἕως πολιῶν εὐρήσεις σοφίαν. ὥς ὁ ἀροτριῶν καὶ ὁ σπείρων πρόσελθε αὐτῇ καὶ ἀνάμενε τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς; Philo fr. 29 τὸ ἔντιμον ἐν γήρᾳ εἶναι ἀπόδειξις τοῦ φιλόπονον προὐ γήρως γεγενῆναι· τῷ δὲ σπουδαίῳ ἐν νεότητι ἐχέγγυον τὸ ἔντιμον ἐν γήρᾳ ἔσεσθαι (in H. Lewy, 'Neue Philontexte in der Überarbeitung des Ambrosius. Mit einem Anhang: Neugefundene griechische Philonfragmente', *SPAW ph.-hist. Kl.* [1932]: 80–84); Lact. *div. inst.* 7.12.12 *senectus non minuit sapientiam, sed auget, si tamen iuvenilis aetas virtute decursa est*; John Chrys. *hom. in Mt.* 49.6 (PG 58:504); John Cass. *coll.* 2.13 *divitiae enim senum non sunt canitie capitis, sed industria iuventutis ac praeteritorum laborum stipendiis metiendae*; Theod. *epist.* 28 οἱ τοῖς πόνοις τῆς ἀρετῆς λαμπρύναντες τὴν ἀκμὴν μετ' ἡδονῆς πρὸς τὸ γῆρας ἐλαύνουσιν· ἐπὶ μὲν ταῖς προτέραις εὐφραινόμενοι νίκαις, τῶν δὲ πλειόνων ἀγῶνων διὰ τὸ γῆρας ἀπηλλαγμένοι. That the cultivation of virtue in youth is the best viaticum for old age was an important axiom in Roman Stoic philosophy; see Sen. *dial.* 10.15.2; Muson. Ruf. fr. 17, with J. Dillon, *Musonius Rufus and*

*Education in the Good Life* (Lanham, 2004), 26–27. At *hom. in Mt.* 81.5 (PG 58:738) Chrysostom, adverting to a nautical rather than an agricultural metaphor, spells out the consequences of *not* cultivating virtue in youth: ὅταν γάρ ἐν μὲν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡλικίᾳ μὴδὲν μανθάνωμεν ὑγιές, ἐν δὲ τῇ νεότητι μὴ σωφρονήσωμεν, καὶ ἄνδρες γενόμενοι φιλαργυρίας μὴ περιγενώμεθα, ὥσπερ εἰς τινα ἀντλίαν τὸ γῆρας ἐλθόντες, καὶ πάσαις ταῖς πληγαῖς ταύταις τὸ σκάφος τῆς ψυχῆς ἀσθενέστερον κατασκευάσαντες, τῶν σανίδων διαλελυμένων, ἀπαντησόμεθα εἰς ἐκεῖνον τὸν λιμένα, πολὺν ἐπιφερόμενοι φορυτὸν ἀντὶ πνευματικῆς ἐμπορίας.

This section has a latent but nonetheless noteworthy autobiographical dimension in that Jer., as he presents himself in his authorial *persona* throughout the letter to Nepotian, fulfills his own ideal by combining an exceptional educational background (*qui adulescentiam suam honestis artibus instruxerunt*)—which is evident not only from his own statements to this effect (1.2, 4.1) but also from his very numerous references to classical literature as well as the superabundance of Ciceronianisms in his prose—with an indefatigable devotion to Scripture and all things divine (*in lege domini meditati sunt die ac nocte*), which is implied by his deft handling of the biblical text, whether through his generous quotations of passages from both Testaments or through his erudite (though, by modern standards, fanciful) allegorical treatment of the Abishag story. Since he has fortified himself in his youth both spiritually and intellectually, he is now able to reap “the most savory fruits of past pursuits” by being in a position, in his ‘old age’, to give expert guidance to Nepotian.

*rursus admoneo* Augustine also uses this emphatic parenthetical expression in the first person (*cons. evang.* 2.30.77, 4.3.4).

*qui adulescentiam suam honestis artibus instruxerunt* By the hypallagic *honestae artes* Jer. means the *liberales artes*. He uses it in this sense also at *epist.* 3.4.2; cf. Cic. *Cael.* 9, *Brut.* 213, *off.* 1.151; Tac. *ann.* 3.66.4, 12.6.1, 14.15.3. Like Jer., Gregory of Nazianzus subscribed to the ideal of erudition and piety working in synergy, and at *orat.* 43.12 he says that young men who attain pre-eminence in both their education and personal holiness possess perfection and are living the heavenly life here on earth, while those who excel in only one or the other are handicapped and walk about like one-eyed men.

*in lege domini meditati sunt die ac nocte* An allusion to Ps. 1:2b (*in lege eius meditabitur die ac nocte*), a versicle of which Jer. was extremely fond; it is referenced nearly thirty times in his extant writings. He links this biblical

passage with the need to be conscientiously pious from youth and into old age also at *comm. in Is.* 29.13–14 ll. 34–37, 46.3–7 ll. 46–49.

This biblically inspired statement refers here to intensive study of the Bible. Likewise Jer. elsewhere boasts of his own *ab adulescentia usque ad hanc aetatem cotidiana in lege, prophetis, evangelis apostolisque meditatio* (*epist.* 50.1.3), and he also praises the youthful Nepotian's *legis Christi indefessa meditatio* (*epist.* 60.11.3). Possidius alludes to this same verset, and invests it with the same connotation of Scriptural study, in the context of describing Augustine's pious lifestyle following his return from Italy to North Africa in 388 (*v. Aug.* 3.2 *ad quos veniens et in quibus constitutus ferme triennio et a se iam alienatis, cum his qui eidem adhaerebant deo vivebat, ieiuniis, orationibus, bonis operibus, in lege domini meditando die ac nocte*); cf. M. Vessey, "Conference and Confession: Literary Pragmatics in Augustine's *Apologia contra Hieronymum*," *JECS* 1 (1993): 175–213 (175).

According to *TLL* VII iv.576.22 ff., the construction *meditari in* + obj. (abl.) is a principally Christian usage.

*aetate fit doctior, usu tritior, processu temporis sapientior* In the midst of a rather elaborate period Jer. embeds this rhetorically effective tricolon marked by asyndeton, homoioteleuton, and perfect parison. It was a stereotype in Greco-Roman antiquity that with age comes a deterioration of mental acuity and especially of the memory; see e.g. Aristoph. *Nub.* 129, 854, with S. Byl, "Le vieillard dans les comédies d'Aristophane," *AC* 46 (1977): 52–73; Plat. *Phaedr.* 276d, *Lach.* 189c; Lucr. *rer. nat.* 3.445–454; Cic. *senect.* 21; Sen. *controv.* 1, praef. 2–5; Juv. *sat.* 10.233–236; Greg. Naz. *orat.* 42.20. Aristotle, for instance, believed that the mind reaches its peak development at the age of forty-nine (*rhet.* 2.14.4) and that thereafter it begins experiencing a slow but steady decline; see A.R. Chandler, "Aristotle on Mental Aging," *Journal of Gerontology* 3 (1948): 220–224; A. Dyroff, *Der Peripatos über das Greisenalter* (Paderborn, 1939), 15–34. It also was widely believed that such diminution could be stemmed somewhat by intellectual pursuits (cf. Cokayne, 68, 93), provided that one continues to build upon the intellectual and spiritual foundation laid in youth. Jer. voices such optimism with his riveting tricolon *aetate fit doctior, usu tritior, processu temporis sapientior*, which is marked by asyndeton, homoioteleuton, and *disiunctio*.

### 3-5

*sapiens ille Graeciae* From the context (see following n.) it is clear that this generic epithet refers to Theophrastus of Eresus (c.371–c.287 BC), Aristotle's

successor as head of the Peripatos at Athens after the latter's death in 322; see J. Lynch, *Aristotle's School: A Study of a Greek Educational Institution* (Berkeley, 1972), 97–105.

*cum expletis centum et septem annis se mori cerneret, dixisse fertur dolere quod tunc egrederetur e vita quando sapere coepisset* *fertur* sometimes has an apologetic sense, i.e. when an author wishes to shift the responsibility for the factual accuracy of reportage from himself to others; see e.g. A. Laird, *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation and Latin Literature* (Oxford, 1999), 123–126. Jer.'s *fertur* here, however, is neutral, and he signals by it only that he has retrieved the anecdote from some unspecified source, be it literary or oral. His immediate source, whom he neglects to credit, is in fact Cicero: *Theophrastus autem moriens accusasse naturam dicitur, quod cervis et cornicibus vitam diuturnam, quorum id nihil interesset, hominibus, quorum maxime interfuisset, tam exiguum vitam dedisset; quorum si aetas potuisset esse longinquior, futurum fuisse ut omnibus perfectis artibus omni doctrina hominum vita erudiretur. querebatur igitur se tum, cum illa videre coepisset, extingui* (*Tusc. disp.* 3.69). Diogenes Laertius reports Theophrastus last words differently: πασι δ' αὐτὸν ἐρωτηθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν εἴ τι ἐπισκῆπτει, εἰπεῖν, ἐπισκῆπτειν μὲν ἔχειν οὐδέν, πλὴν ὅτι πολλὰ τῶν ἡδέων ὁ βίος διὰ τὴν δόξαν καταλαζονεύεται. ἡμεῖς γὰρ ὁπότ' ἀρχόμεθα ζῆν, τότε ἀποθνήσκομεν. οὐδὲν οὖν ἀλυσιτελέστερόν ἐστι φιλοδοξίας. ἀλλ' εὐτυχεῖτε καὶ ἤτοι τὸν λόγον ἄφετε—πολὺς γὰρ ὁ πόνος—, ἢ καλῶς αὐτοῦ προστητε· μεγάλη γὰρ ἡ δόξα. τὸ δὲ κενὸν τοῦ βίου πλεῖον τοῦ συμφέροντος. ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐκέτ' ἐκποιεῖ βουλευέσθαι τί πρακτέον, ὑμεῖς δ' ἐπισκέψασθε τί ποιητέον. ταῦτα, φασίν, εἰπὼν ἀπέπνευσε (5.40–41). Which of these two accounts is the more historically reliable cannot be ascertained; see J. Mejer, “A Life in Fragments: The *Vita Theophrasti*,” in J. van Ophuijsen and M. van Raalte (eds.), *Theophrastus: Reappraising the Sources* (New Brunswick, 1998), 1–28 (17).

According to Diogenes Laertius (5.40), Theophrastus was eighty-five when he died. Cicero, Jer.'s source for the death-bed anecdote about Theophrastus (see above), nowhere mentions the philosopher's age at his death. In asserting that he was 107 Jer. is almost certainly confusing Theophrastus with Gorgias (cf. Cic. *senect.* 13 *Leontinus Gorgias centum et septem complevit annos*); cf. J. Diggle, *Theophrastus: Characters* (Cambridge, 2004), 163; Hagendahl, 194.

*Plato octogesimo et uno anno scribens est mortuus* Cf. Cic. *senect.* 13 *qualem [senectutem] acceperimus Platonis, qui uno et octogesimo anno scribens est*

*mortuus*. Diogenes (3.2), quoting Hermippus, also reports that Plato died at eighty-one—as does Valerius Maximus (8.7 ext. 3) as well—but adds that he died while attending a wedding banquet (as opposed to dying while being engaged in literary activity, as in Cicero and Jer.). For an inventory of the various apocryphal anecdotes about the circumstances surrounding Plato's death, see A. Riginos, *Platonica* (New York, 1976), 194–198.

*Isocrates nonaginta et novem annos in docendi scribendique labore complevit* Cf. Cic. *senect.* 13 *qualem [senectutem] Isocratis, qui eum librum, qui Panathenaicus inscribitur, quarto nonagesimo anno scripsisse dicit vixitque quinquennium postea*; see also Val. Max. *mem.* 8.7 ext. 9, which appears to be based on Cicero (Powell, 131). Plutarch (837e–f, 838b) says that Isocrates died at either ninety-eight or 100, after starving himself to death (in 338) upon hearing of the defeat of the Athenians by Philip's army. Cf. Dion. Hal. *Isocr.* 1; Pausan. *Gr. descr.* 1.18.8; Lucian *macr.* 23; Philostr. *v. soph.* 1.17.4.

*taceo ceteros philosophos* Jer. follows this *praeteritio* (cf. on 2.2 *taceo de prioribus ante diluvium viris*) with a robust listing of Greek philosophers and poets who lived to extreme old age. His inventory has been borrowed wholesale from Cic. *senect.* 23 *num Homerum, Hesiodum, Simoniden, Stesichorum, num quos ante dixi, Isocraten Gorgian, num philosophorum principes, Pythagoram Democritum, num Platonem, num Xenocraten, num postea Zenonem Cleanthem aut eum quem vos etiam vidistis Romae, Diogenem Stoicum, coegit in suis studiis obmutescere senectus? an in omnibus his studiorum agitatio vitae aequalis fuit?* Jer. has for some unknown reason chosen to omit Gorgias and the Stoic philosopher Diogenes of Babylon, and he also has reversed Cicero's ordering, naming the philosophers before the poets. These differences in both structure and content, especially when considered alongside his failure to credit Cicero's *De senectute* as his source for this and other information presented in the first three chapters of the letter, may plausibly be explained as Jer.'s attempt to disguise his literary theft and to give the reader a false impression about the comprehensiveness of his grasp of classical Greek literature *writ large* and the anecdotal trivia concerning various figures in its hall of fame.

*Pythagoram* The son of an engraver (Mnesarchus of Samos), the Ionian mathematician, philosopher, and religious cult founder Pythagoras (c.570–c.490/80 BC) was perhaps either eighty or ninety when he died (Diog. Laert. 7.44).



*Democritum* Democritus (c.460–c.356 BC) was the disciple of Leucippus, the founder of atomism, but he developed atomistic theory to such an extent that some ancient authorities (e.g. Epicurus, who went so far as to deny the existence of Leucippus; see Diog. Laert. 10.13) considered him to be its real founder. Fragments of his writings are in H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (6th ed., 3 vols., Berlin, 1951–1952), 2.130–207. Democritus appears to have had a very positive attitude toward the aging process; see H. Herter, 'Demokrit über das Alter', *WJA* 1 (1975): 83–92. The sources disagree about the age at which he died, whether it was ninety (Diod. 14.11.5), 104 (Lucian *macr.* 18), or 109 (Hipparchus *apud* Diog. Laert. 9.43).

*Xenocratem* Xenocrates of Chalcedon was a disciple of Plato and served as head of the Academy from 339 to 314 BC. If we are to judge from the titles of his known (lost) works and from his fragments (for which, see M. Isnardi Parente, *Senocrate-Ermodoro: Frammenti* [Naples, 1982]), he was interested primarily in issues of practical morality. The sources give his age at death variously as eighty-one (Cens. *nat.* 15.2), eighty-two (Diog. Laert. 4.14), and eighty-four (Lucian *macr.* 20). Jer. mentions him also at *comm. in Os.* 1.2 ll. 122–126, *adv. Iov.* 2.14.

*Zenonem* Zeno (c.334–c.262 BC), the founder of the Stoic school of philosophy, lived to be ninety-eight according to Lucian (*macr.* 19), but only seventy-two according to Diogenes Laertius (7.28); Powell, 153, suggests that this discrepancy may be due to confusion between homonymous philosophers. His works are extant only in fragments; see A.C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes* (London, 1891).

*Cleanthem* Cleanthes of Assos (c.331–c.232 BC), Zeno's successor as head of the Stoa, authored lost treatises on cosmological themes. Jer. mentions him in passing at *apol. c. Ruf.* 1.30. The available sources put his age at death at either eighty (Diog. Laert. 7.176) or ninety-nine (Lucian *macr.* 19; Val. Max. *mem.* 8.7 ext. 11; Cens. *nat.* 15.3).

*Homerum* Although Homer is customarily portrayed in Hellenistic and Roman sculpture and iconography as an old man (see e.g. P. Zanker, *The Mask of Socrates* [Berkeley, 1995], 20), there is no reliable evidence for his longevity or literary activity in old age. Nevertheless, Longinus (9.11–15) accounts for the pronounced thematic and tonal differences between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* by judging the latter to be the work of the poet's old age.

*Hesiodum* Nothing firm is known about the twilight years of Hesiod (fl. c.700 BC). Thucydides (*hist.* 3.96.1) cites a local tradition that Hesiod died in Opuntian Locris, and the Greek *Contest between Homer and Hesiod* (vv. 342–344) adds that the poet had had illicit sexual relations with the daughter of Phegeus of Locris and that her brothers Amphiphanis and Galuctor murdered him in revenge. According to some versions of this story, Hesiod's lover gives birth to a son, Stesichorus (see below on *Stesichorum*); on the relationship between these two poets as imagined by various ancient traditions, see A. Beecroft, *Authorship and Cultural Identity in Early Greece and China* (Cambridge, 2010), 168–170.

*Simonidem* Born around the middle of the sixth century BC, Simonides was a wide-ranging Greek poet who composed choral lyric, elegies, dithyrambs, epigrams, and paeans. In an epigram composed by him which is preserved by Plutarch (785a) the poet describes himself at the time of writing as being eighty years old. Lucian (*macr.* 26) claims that he lived to be more than ninety (cf. Val. Max. *mem.* 8.7 ext. 13). At *epist.* 53.8.17 Jer. calls David *Simonides noster* for his poetic prowess as a psalmist.

*Stesichorum* Lucian (*macr.* 26) says that the now-fragmentary (for the remains, see M. Davies, *Poetarum melicorum graecorum fragmenta*, vol. 1 [Oxford, 1991], 133–234) lyric poet Stesichorus (fl. c.560–540 BC; see M.L. West, “Stesichorus,” *CQ* n.s. 21 [1971]: 302–314 [306]) died when he was eighty-five. Jer. mentions Stesichorus also at *adv. Iov.* 1.10, *epist.* 102.1.1, 112.18.1.

*grandes natu* During the classical period *grandis natu* was a standard prose locution for ‘old’ (e.g. Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.76; Plin. *min. epist.* 8.23.7; for a rare poetic usage, see Hor. *epist.* 1.7.49), but by the fourth century AD it evidently had mostly fallen out of literary use and is attested almost exclusively in historiographic texts (Aurel. Vict. *hist. abbrev.* 41.11; Anon. *hist. Aug.* 12.7.1, 19.14.2, 20.15.2, 21.2.1). Jer.'s deployment of it only here probably was prompted by its two occurrences in Cicero's *De senectute* (10, 63), on which he draws very extensively in this portion of the letter to Nepotian.

*cygneum nescio quid et solito dulcius vicina morte cecinerunt* The legend of the swan singing a melodious premortem song is first attested in Greece in 458 BC, when Aeschylus had Clytemnestra compare the recently deceased Cassandra to a swan who has just sung her death lament (*Agam.* 1444–1445). More than a century later Plato had Socrates attribute this sweet song to the swan's joy that it would soon join Apollo (to whom swans were sacred) in

the afterlife; Socrates then characterizes his own last words as a triumphant swan-song (*Phaed.* 84e–85a). Owing to Plato the legend of the swan-song became a commonplace in literature both Greek (W.G. Arnott, “Swan Songs,” *G&R* 24 [1977]: 149–153 [153n2]) and Latin (Otto, 104–105). This legend has some basis in scientific fact. As modern ornithologists have observed (e.g. S.B. Wilmore, *Swans of the World* [London, 1974], 129–130), the whooper swan (*Cygnus cygnus*), one of two species of swan present in ancient Greece (the other being the mute swan, *Cygnus olor*) which are still around today, lets out a flute-like sound as dies. This musical cry, it is hypothesized, results from air from its collapsing lungs flowing irregularly through the extra loop of its trachea, which is convoluted inside its sternum; see M. Brazil, *The Whooper Swan* (London, 2003), 64.

At *epist.* 60.1.2 Jer. applies the swan-song imagery to the deceased Nepotian (*ubi est ... cycneo canore vox dulcior?*) This probably was no coincidence: he presumably had the present passage in mind from a fresh reading of *Epistula* 52 that he had done in preparation for commemorating Nepotian in *Epistula* 60.

### 3.6

*Sophocles cum propter nimiam senectutem et rei familiaris negligentiam a filiis accusaretur amentiae, Oedipi fabulam, quam nuper scripserat, recitavit iudicibus et tantum sapientiae in aetate iam fracta specimen dedit ut severitatem tribunalium in theatri favorem verteret* This famous anecdote (cf. P. Mazon, “Sophocle devant ses juges,” *REA* 82 [1945]: 82–96) about the circumstances surrounding the composition of Sophocles’ final play *Oedipus at Colonus*, which he wrote shortly before his death in 406, is reported by a number of ancient authorities (e.g. Plut. 785a–b; Apul. *apol.* 37; Lucian *macr.* 24), including Cicero (*senect.* 22), which clearly is Jer.’s source: ***Sophocles ad summam senectutem tragoedias fecit; quod propter studium cum rem neglegere familiarem videretur, a filiis in iudicium vocatus est, ut quem ad modum nostro more male rem gerentibus patribus bonis interdici solet, sic illum quasi desipientem*** [cf. Jer.’s *amentiae*] ***a re familiari removerent iudices. tum senex dicitur eam fabulam quam in manibus habebat et proxime scripserat, Oedipum Coloneum, recitasse iudicibus quaesisseque num illud carmen desipientis videretur. quo recitato sententiis iudicum est liberatus.*** Jer. condenses his model while retaining key phraseological echoes, and he also improves upon the rather flat Ciceronian *sententiis iudicum est liberatus* with his chiasmic antithesis *severitatem tribunalium in theatri favorem verteret*.

*Romani generis disertissimus* This flattering epithet for Cato, which Jer. uses again at *epist.* 61.3.3, is taken over from Sallust's now-fragmentary *Histories*; see N. Adkin, "Cato, *Romani generis disertissimus* (Sallust, *Hist.* fr. I 4 M. in Jerome)," *Eikasmos* 9 (1998): 229–232; R. Funari, *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum fragmenta*, I (Amsterdam, 1996), 8. Adkin (*ibid.*, 230) detects an inconsonance in Jer.'s application of this epithet here in that "the linguistic gaucherie implied in *erubuerit* and *desperaverit* is at odds with the proficiency attested by *disertissimus*". Cato is an icon of Roman wisdom and eloquence in e.g. Cic. *amic.* 5, *de orat.* 1.171; Quint. *inst. orat.* 11.1.36; Aul. Gell. *noct. Att.* 10.3.16; Tert. *apol.* 11.

*ensorius iam et senex Graecas litteras nec erubuerit nec desperaverit discere* Writing to Demetrias some twenty years later, Jer. reproduced much of this same passage: *Catonem quoque—illum dico censorium et vestrae quondam urbis principem—, qui in extrema aetate Graecas litteras non erubuit censor nec desperavit senex discere* (*epist.* 130.13.2). He amplified his earlier version in the letter to Nepotian by inserting the parenthesis *illum dico censorium et vestrae quondam urbis principem* and the emphatic *in extrema aetate*, which is pleonastic in relation to *senex*. When Cato served as censor in 184/3 (*censorius* was a standard epithet for him; see e.g. Cic. *de orat.* 2.260; Sen. *epist.* 87.9; Tac. *ann.* 3.66.1; Jer. *adv. Iov.* 1.48), he was fifty years old, and so Jer.'s characterization of him in both places as a *senex* is somewhat misleading. The tradition that Cato began intensively studying Greek literature late in life is reported first by Cicero (*acad. pr.* 2.5, *senect.* 3, 26, 38) and later by Nepos (*Cato* 3.2), Valerius Maximus (8.7.1), and Quintilian (*inst. orat.* 12.11.23). Jer.'s phraseology most immediately recalls words put into Cato's mouth at *senect.* 26 *qui litteras Graecas senex didici*. Cicero's *litteras Graecas* does not mean "the Greek language" but "Greek literature", for Cato had been proficient in the language long before making a special study of the literature (see Plut. *Cato* 12; cf. Powell, 103). Jer.'s *Graecas litteras* has the same sense, though some translators have misconstrued it (e.g. Carroll, 83: "Greek"; Cola, 1.447: "il greco"; Fremantle, 90: "Greek"; Wright, 195: "Greek ... knowledge of that language"). His choice of the verb *erubescere* hints at the ancient opposition to opsimathy (cf. e.g. Arist. *Nub.* 129; Cic. *epist. ad fam.* 9.20.2; see further Cokayne, 110–111). *erubescere* with a dependent infinitive (cf. *TLL* V 1 vi.822.66 ff.) is first attested in Virgil (*ecl.* 6.2 *nostra neque erubuit silvas habitare Thalea*), then Livy (10.8.5, 42.41.2, 45.35.5), and subsequently in later authors rather more frequently; cf. on 12.2 *non erubescimus istiusmodi ineptitiis*.

*certe Homerus refert quod de lingua Nestoris iam vetuli et paene decrepiti dulcior melle oratio fluxerit* Jer. almost certainly never read the *Iliad* in Greek—see Courcelle, 50; Lübeck, 11; W. McDermott, “Saint Jerome and Pagan Greek Literature,” *VChr* 31 (1982): 372–382 (372, 380) is more optimistic. He gleaned this particular detail about the elderly Nestor’s mellifluous eloquence secondhand from Cic. *senect.* 31 *videtisne ut apud Homerum saepissime Nestor de virtutibus suis praedicet? ... “etenim”, ut ait Homerus, “ex eius lingua melle dulcior fluebat oratio”*; cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.249 τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδὴ; see also Quint. *inst. orat.* 12.10.64. M. Finley, *The World of Odysseus* (rev. ed., New York, 2002), 116, remarks that Nestor “became the prototype of the wisdom of old age” in the Homeric epic landscape. On the ‘sweeter than honey’ *topos* in ancient literature, see Otto, 216–217.

*vetuli ... decrepiti* These two adjectives are juxtaposed elsewhere only in Plautus, and in both cases they are used by *senes* to refer to fellow *senes*. At *Epid.* 666 Periphanes asks his friend Apoecides: *satine illic homo ludibrio nos vetulos decrepitos duos habet?*, and at *Merc.* 314 Lysimachus, chiding Demipho for falling in love with a young girl, contemptuously calls him a *vetulus decrepitus senex* (cf. *Merc.* 291 *senex vetus, decrepitus*). Jer., who knew the Plautine corpus well (cf. Hagendahl; López Fonseca), likely has lifted this otherwise unattested verbal collocation from the Roman playwright.

### 3.7

*sed* Here the conjunction does not have its usual adversative force (cf. Kroon, 216–217) but rather it signals a return from a digression (see *OLD* sv *sed* 2b); the translators have either neglected to account for *sed* (e.g. Carroll, 83; Cola, 1.448) or have misunderstood its meaning (e.g. Labourt, 2.176 ‘mais’).

*ipsius Abisag nominis sacramentum sapientiam senum indicat ampliorem* Jer. is looking back to 3.2, where he left off his discussion of Abishag with a quotation from Prov. 4:5–9, immediately after which he explored the physical limitations of old age. With the present alliterative passage he resumes from the question originally posed at 3.1: *quae est igitur ista Sunamitis uxor et virgo tam fervens ut frigidum calefaceret, tam sancta ut calentem ad libidinem non provocaret?* In the remainder of this chapter he argues, on the basis of the Hebrew etymology of her name, that David’s consort Abishag is not a

literal person but an allegory for divine wisdom and perfect knowledge of Scripture which figuratively warms the king in his chilly old age. At *comm. in Am.* lib. 2, prol. ll. 10–11 (*frigescente corpore [senectus] dormit cum perpetua virgine Sunamite*) he hints at this same interpretation, but in other references to her in his extant works he treats her as an historical personage (*adv. Iov.* 1.24, *comm. in Is.* 3.7.14 ll. 58–61). Why, then, does he advance the allegorical interpretation in *Epistula* 52?

Thus far in the letter Jer. has gone to considerable lengths, through the digression spanning from 1.2 to 4.4, to establish his uncontested authority as a teacher of monastic ethics. He uses what is essentially syllogistic logic: he is a *senex* (1.2); wisdom is the hallmark of *senectus* (3.2–6); therefore, he is an eminently wise advisor on matters of practical Christian spirituality (4.3–4). But he uses the digression also to establish his intellectual authority, i.e. his status as an expert biblical exegete. In it he masterfully displays his ability to unlock the hidden mysteries of Scripture (he uses *sacramentum* in this sense also at 2.1, 3.7, 3.8) through the application of allegorical exposition. Lest the allegorical meaning seem arbitrarily assigned and therefore suspect, he supports his interpretation with Hebrew etymologies (3.7–8), which themselves are in turn buttressed by typological connections made from a *corolla* of apt biblical texts culled from both Testaments (3.8–9). Jer., then, presents an elegant little case-study in biblical exegesis that showcases his expertise as a Hebrew philologist and his purportedly encyclopedic knowledge of Scripture—both of which, according to the Hieronymian ideal, are essential components of the scholarly apparatus of any legitimate biblical expositor (see Cain 2010a, 36–39).

Kelly, 191, calls this “one of Jerome’s most audacious feats of exegesis”, but he may be over-crediting our author with exegetical ingenuity. This interpretation is unparalleled in the surviving Greek and Latin patristic literature; the closest analogue appears to be Quodvultdeus’ likening of Abishag warming David to chastity setting the soul alight: *haec in similitudine animam signat dei gratia castitatis calore succensam quae frigidas in fide animas, ut membra regis magni, suo accendit affectu* (*lib. prom. et praed. dei* 2.27). Nor is it found anywhere in rabbinical literature. Given Jer.’s occasional incorporation of rabbinical interpretations into his biblical exegesis (see e.g. M. Kraus, “Christian, Jews, and Pagans in Dialogue: Jerome on Ecclesiastes 12:1–7,” *HUCA* 70–71 [1999–2000]: 183–231), we must preliminarily consider the possibility of Jewish influence on his allegorical interpretation of Abishag; however, the rabbis seem to treat her uniformly as a literal, historical figure. At any rate, Jer.’s interpretation sounds suspiciously Origenian (e.g. at *hom. in Num.* 19.1 Origen takes David’s two wives captured

by Amalek [1 Sam. 30:5] to be typological symbols of Christians who come from both the Jews and Gentiles). In his extant exegetical corpus Origen nowhere gives the precise interpretation ventured here by Jer., yet by the same token it should be borne in mind that much of Origen's biblical exegesis has not come down to us. In support of Origen's candidacy is the fact that Jer. adopts the very same characteristically Origenian biblical proof-texts to corroborate his Hebrew etymologies (see on 3.8 *Phares ... Raab* and 3.9 *ignem ... ardeat ... nonne ... scripturas*). Yet even if Jer. did not lift this interpretation directly from the pages of Origen, it can be said at the very least that it most probably was inspired by the Greek Father's allegorizing hermeneutic (not to mention his flair for fanciful etymological derivations), by which Jer., as a biblical commentator, was profoundly influenced. For his indebtedness to Origen's exegesis, see e.g. Cain 2011, 93–94 (with references to further bibliography); H.-J. Sieben, "Israels Wüstenwanderung (Num 33) in der Auslegung des Hieronymus und des Origenes: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Spiritualität und der origenistischen Streitigkeiten," *Th&Ph* 77 (2002): 1–22.

Jer.'s interpretation enjoyed a modest *fortuna* in medieval exegesis (e.g. Peter Damian in the eleventh century; *epist.* 135 p. 458 Reindel), particularly in the twelfth century, influencing the anonymous author of the poem *Liber praefigurationum Christi et ecclesiae* (CCCM 195:87), Guerric d'igny (SChr 166:312), Hugo of St. Victor (C.H. Buttmer, *Hugonis de Sancto Victore Didascalicon De Studio Legendi* [Washington, 1939], 65), Philip of Harueng (PL 203:886–890), and Rupert of Deutz (CCCM 22:1112).

*interpretatur* For this passive use of *interpretari*, see *TLL* VII 1.2257.77 ff.

'*pater meus superfluous*' vel '*patris mei rugitus*' Cf. *hebr. nom.* p. 40 Lagarde *Abisai pater meus superfluous sive patris mei rugitus*; Gesenius, 46, glosses the proper name אֲבִישַׁי as, 'My father is a wanderer'.

*in praesenti loco virtutem sonat ... in alio autem loco 'superfluous' quasi 'non necessarius' ponitur.* Cf. Aul. Gell. *noct. Att.* 1.22.10 *sic nostros quoque veteres 'superesse' alias dixisse pro superfluenti et vacivo neque admodum necessario, ita, ut supra posuimus, Varronem dicere, alias ita, ut Cicero dixit, pro eo, quod copia quidem et facultate ceteris antea, super modum tamen et largius prolixiusque flueret, quam esset satis.*

*quod amplior sit in senibus et redundans ac larga sapientia* Cf. above *ipsius Abisai nominis sacramentum sapientiam senum indicat ampliorem.*

'sag' autem, id est 'rugitus' Cf. *comm. in Am.* 1.2 ll. 124–125 *rugiet Hebraice dicitur iesag.*

*ut ita dicam* On this common expression, see M. Hélin, "Vt ita dicam et similia: recherches sur le sens linguistique de quelques écrivains du moyen âge," in *Hommages à L. Herrmann* (Brussels, 1960), 420–430; M. Nagnajewicz, "De locutionis ut ita dicam et similiū usu Quintiliano," *Eos* 54 (1964): 289–306; for Jer.'s use of it, see Antin, 241–249.

*de pelago veniens fremitus auditur* Jer. uses this auditory description for a body of water also at *comm. in Is.* 7.17.12–14 ll. 19–20, *comm. in Zach.* 11.3 l. 64, *epist.* 3.4.4.

### 3.8

*ex quo ostenditur* This expression and its variant *ex quo ostendit* (where the subject of *ostendit* is a biblical writer) introduce glosses of Scriptural passages on nearly four dozen occasions in Jer.

*abundantissimum et ultra humanam vocem divini sermonis in senibus tonitruum commorari* By *divini sermonis* (here in antithesis to *humanam vocem*) Jer. means the *vox dei* as revealed in Scripture. He likens the words of Scripture to thunder also at *epist.* 78.3.3 (*quod autem verba divina et eloquia scripturarum in istius saeculi et mundi rota tonitruus appellentur; psalmista declarat dicens: vox tonitruī tui in rota, et dei patris vocem in baptismo salvatoris audientes tonitruum putaverunt; cf. tract. in Ps.* 1. 68 *tonitruum est enim vox domini*). For the association of thunder with divinity in the Greco-Roman and Near Eastern worlds, see J. Brown, *Israel and Hellas*, vol. 2: *Sacred Institutions with Roman Counterparts* (Berlin, 2000), 62–68.

'coccinea' Cf. *hebr. nom.* p. 40 Lagarde *Sunem coccineum sive elevans.*

*calere ... fervere* For the association of the color scarlet with heat, cf. e.g. Aug. *quaest. in hept.* 4.33 *coccinum caritas, quod fervorem spiritus igneo colore testatur*; scarlet represents modesty at Greg. Nys. v. *Mos.* 2.196 and John Chrys. *sacerd.* 2.6. On the religious symbolism of this color, see M. Armstrong, *The Significance of Certain Colors in Roman Ritual* (Menasha, 1917), 1–20.



*divina lectione* Here *divina lectio* signifies the act of reading Scripture, but elsewhere it refers to the Scriptural text itself as a physical artifact (*comm. in Eph.* lib. 1 p. 491, *comm. in Tit.* 3.9 l. 181, *adv. Iov.* 2.35, *epist.* 79.9.2).

*licet dominici sanguinis indicet sacramentum* For Origen, too, the color scarlet mystically represents the blood of Christ, i.e. as it issued forth from his side on the cross after being pierced by the lance (*hom. in Lev.* 8.10); cf. the following n. For the word *sacramentum*, see on 2.1 *sacramenta*.

*Phares ... Raab* Jer. has the scarlet thread tied by the midwife onto Perez's wrist, but in fact the biblical account states that it was tied onto the wrist of his brother Zerah (Gen. 38:27–29). Origen appears to be the only other patristic exegete besides Jer. (and even he only in the letter to Nepotian) to connect this thread with the scarlet-colored rope that Rahab tied in her window at the request of the two Israelite spies (Jos. 2:18, 21), and then to interpret *both* of these items as foreshadowing the passion of Christ. See Orig. *comm. in Mt. ser.* 125 (GCS 11:261) *illa enim coccinea chlamys mysterium erat coccinei signi quod scriptum est in Iesu Nave, quod ad salutem suam habuit illa Rahab, et in Genesi, quod factum est in uno filiorum Thamar ad manum nascentis, ut coccum alligaretur in signo futurae passionis Christi* (cf. *hom. in Lev.* 8.10; Ledegang, 454–458). The Bible is silent about the identity of these two spies, but one rabbinical tradition held that they were none other than Perez and his twin brother Zerah (Ginzberg, 2.36).

*'divisoris'* Jer. gives this (accurate) gloss for Perez's name in Hebrew (פֶּרֶץ) also at *quaest. hebr. in Gen.* p. 59 Lagarde.

*meretrix* The two most common words in Latin for 'prostitute' are *meretrix* and *scortum*, the latter being in many cases the slightly more pejorative of the two terms; see J.N. Adams, "Words for 'Prostitute' in Latin," *RhM* 126 (1983): 321–358 (321–327). Jer. overwhelmingly prefers *meretrix* to a ratio of 5:1. He uses *scortum* below at 6.1 (*scorta hereditates capiunt*).

*in typo ecclesiae* On Rahab as a type of the church in patristic literature, see H. Urs von Balthasar, *Sponsa verbi* (Einsiedeln, 1961), 203–305; J. Daniélou, "Rahab: figure de l'église," *Irénikon* 22 (1949): 26–45.

*resticulam mysteria sanguinis continentem* Here *sanguis* = *sanguis Christi*. For the identification of Rahab's scarlet cord with the blood of Christ, cf. e.g.

Orig. *hom. in Ios.* 3:5; Aug. *enarr. in Ps.* 86 6; Greg. Elv. *tract. sanc. script.* 12 ll. 260–268.

### 3.9

*“hi sunt Cinaei qui venerunt de calore domus Rechab”* Vulg. 1Chron. 2:55, of which this is a quotation, adds *patris* (*hi sunt Cinei qui venerunt de calore patris domus Rechab*). In both places Jer. renders the toponym חמַת (Ham-math) quasi-literally as *calor*; it actually means ‘hot spring’ and was the name of a town in Naphtali (see Jos. 19:35).

*“ignem ... ardeat” ... “nonne ... scripturas”* Lk. 12:49 and Lk. 24:32, respectively. Jer. quotes these Lucan passages alongside each other also at *epist.* 18A.6.4. Origen also quotes these two verses in conjunction at *hom. in Ios.* 15.3, and he in fact appears to be the only other patristic author besides Jer. to do so. This coincidence, read in tandem with the other parallels noted above, further strengthens the hypothesis that Origen is the source for Jer.’s allegorization of Abishag (cf. on 3.7 *ipsius ... ampliorem*).

## Chapter 4

Jer. promises not to dress his letter in rhetorical frippery. In instructing Nepotian he will rely solely on the power of unvarnished truth, not eloquence, and he introduces a stylish quotation from Cyprian to reinforce this point. He declares his desire to be embraced only by divine Wisdom, symbolized by the figure of Abishag, and thereby he comes full circle with the allegorical exegesis presented in the previous chapter and applies it to his own person. He concludes the chapter, as well as the lengthy preamble to the letter, with a forceful assertion of Heliodorus' and his own spiritual proprietorship over Nepotian.

## 4.1

*quorsum haec tam longo repetita principio?* Jer. now formally signals the conclusion to the digression which has occupied all of the letter up to this point (1.1b–3.9), except for the opening sentence in which he announced the occasion of his writing. The compactness of his Latin, as he states his intention to resume his original plan, is rather ironic in view of the sheer length of the foregoing digression. *principio* refers to the period with which he begins the letter (*petis ... rapiatur*; for *principium* as the very beginning of a *liber*, *epistula*, etc., cf. *TLL* X 1 ix.1307.68 ff.), and not to the digressionary preamble itself, which already is accounted for by *haec ... repetita*; here *repetere* = 'to go over again and again' (cf. Lewis-Short sv *repeto* II A 2), hence 'to belabor'. *longo ... principio* is abl. depending on *repetita* (see Goelzer, 324), and even though [*tam*] *longo* grammatically modifies *principio*, its force is more adverbial than adjectival (thus MSS *D* and *B* have *longe*).

Jer. is rather fond of this phraseology; cf. *epist.* 10.2.1 *quorsum, ais, ista tam alto repetita principio?*, 16.1.1 *quorsum ista tam longo repetita prooemio?*, 58.4.1 *quorsum, inquires, haec tam longo repetita principio?* The basic formulation is Ciceronian; cf. *de orat.* 3.91 *quorsum igitur haec spectat, inquit, tam longa et tam alte repetita oratio?*, *epist. ad fam.* 13.29.2 *expectare te arbitror haec tam longe repetita principia quo spectent*, *Sest.* 31 *vereor ne quis forte vestrum miretur quid haec mea oratio tam longa aut tam alte repetita velit*.

*ne a me quaeras ... audientum* On the three other occasions when he recalled himself from a digression using phraseology akin to *quorsum haec tam longo repetita principio?* (see previous n.), he introduced the explanation of his reasoning with either *videlicet ut* (*epist.* 10.2.1, 16.1.1) or *videlicet*

*ne* (*epist.* 58.4.1), but here he economizes and dispenses with the adverbial *videlicet*.

No patristic writer downplayed his own deployment of rhetorical tactics as frequently or as vociferously as Jer. These repeated protestations may be attributed to his being “a particularly expert and extravagant rhetorician, who is always eager to demonstrate his skill: in consequence he is correspondingly quick to affect modesty” (Adkin, 30). His expression of affected modesty here is itself a rhetorical conceit inasmuch as his prose throughout the letter is refined and clearly informed by advanced training in rhetorical theory and practice. Furthermore, this self-deprecation functions as something of a *captatio benevolentiae* in that it serves to lower his audience’s expectations so that he can then more easily exceed them.

*pueriles declamationes* *puerilis* modifies *declamatio* also at Aug. *c. litt. Pet.* 2.21.48 and *declamatiuncula* at Jer. *dial. c. Pel.* 3.5. In oratorical contexts this adjective often is used pejoratively for pedantic stylistic ploys (cf. *OLD* sv *puerilis* 2). See e.g. Ps.-Long. 3.4 (*puerilis* = μαιρακιδῶδης); Cic. *de orat.* 1.20; Quint. *inst. orat.* 4.1.77, 12.10.73, with R.G. Austin, *Quintiliani Institutionis oratoriae liber XII* (Oxford, 1954), 210. Indeed, the present passage is classified in *TLL* X 2 xvi.2524.5 f. under this very heading. The principal connotation of *pueriles* here undoubtedly is pejorative, i.e. Jer. is dismissing *declamationes* as frivolous exercises which have no meaningful role to play in serious discussions about Christian morality. But it nevertheless is possible that the adjective simultaneously has a temporal sense, i.e. ‘declamations from our youth’ (cf. *TLL* X 2 xvi.2522.57 ff.). After all, in Hieronymian parlance *pueritia* ended at around the age of twenty (see Hamblenne), and it was during their teenage years that the most ambitious Roman students studied declamatory rhetoric in school. The composition and delivery of declamations represented the culmination of the Roman oratorical education; see S. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome* (Berkeley, 1977), 250–327. These practice pieces, which addressed sets of circumstances such as the kind one might encounter in an actual deliberative or judicial setting, came in two varieties: in *suasoriae* students gave decision-making advice to some historical or mythical figure, and in *controversiae* they argued, in character, one or the other side of a mock legal case. Jer. very often alludes to his rhetorical education in Rome more generally (e.g. *comm. in Am. lib.* 2, prol. l. 1, *comm. in Soph.* 3.14–18 ll. 549–554, *comm. in Gal.* 1.2.11–13 ll. 77–78, *epist.* 69.6.1), and on some occasions he specifically mentions his ability to compose declamations (e.g. *c. Vig.* 3, *comm. in Hiez.* 12.40 l. 1151, *comm. in Gal.* 3, prol. l. 45, *epist.* 81.1.3). One of his most famous letters (*epist.* 117), in which he rebukes

an unnamed virgin and her widowed mother for cohabiting with men of the cloth is in fact cast ostensibly as a rhetorical declamation; for an analysis of this remarkable work, see Cain 2009b.

*flosculos* This word has the same general negative connotation as it does in Quintilian (Jer. makes the connection explicit at *epist.* 36.14.1 *nec aures Quintiliani flosculis et scolari declamatione mulcendae*; cf. *alt. Lucif.* 11), who used it to disparage any number of rhetorical conceits that were fashionable in the speeches of his day (*inst. orat.* 2.5.22, 12.10.73; cf. *TLL* VI 1 iv.938.15 ff.). In the parlance of Ciceronian rhetorical theory, *flores* are tropes, choice expressions, or rare words which add grace or *variatio* to a speech (cf. *de orat.* 3.96), and over-use of them is cited by Cicero as a defect of the sophistic style of e.g. Isocrates and Demetrius of Phaleron (*orat.* 19, 27, *Brut.* 82).

*verborum lenocinia* At *inst. orat.* 8, praef. 23–26 Quintilian pinpoints the defining characteristic of a ‘meretricious’ style as fastidiousness about selecting pretentious words and turns of phrase. Elsewhere Jer. employs the harlotry metaphor to denounce the turgid homiletical style that prevailed in many churches in his day (*comm. in Eccl.* 9.17 ll. 362–365, *comm. in Gal.* lib. 3, prol. ll. 8–10). Cf. *epist.* 118.1.3 *nos leporem artis rhetoricae contemnentes et puerilis atque plausibilis eloquii venustatem ad sanctarum scripturarum gravitatem confugimus*.

*per fines capitum singulorum acuta quaedam breviterque conclusa* Jer. is referring to the common (on its prevalence, see Anax. *rhet.* 32.3; Quint. *inst. orat.* 8.5.11, 13–14) ancient rhetorical practice of concluding passages or whole arguments with a witty saying (ἐπιφώνημα) or petty maxim (*sensiculus*), which aimed either to elicit an emotional reaction from the audience (see Demetr. *eloc.* 106–111) or to serve as a transition from one part of the argument to another. This latter usage, which was in vogue in the rhetorical schools of the early Empire, is criticized by Quintilian as being a *frigida et puerilis adfectatio* designed merely to win applause (*inst. orat.* 4.1.77–79; cf. Ps.-Long. 4.3). Jer. deploys the technique elsewhere (e.g. *epist.* 22.6.6), and, despite his disavowal of it here, he does so also in the letter to Nepotian—e.g. *minori labore margaritum Christi emi poterat* (6.5) and *gemmae vertuntur in scuta* (13.3).

*quae plausus et clamores excitent audientum* *excitent* is subjunctive in a relative clause of purpose, hence ‘which are calculated to elicit applause and shouts of approbation from the audience’. Jer. often denounces the

seeking of applause through rhetorical grandstanding: see *comm. in Eccl.* 3.6–7 ll. 124–126, 7.5 ll. 55–56, 9.17 ll. 362–365, *comm. in Is.*, prol. ll. 100–103, *comm. in Hiez.* lib. 8, prol. ll. 1–3, 11.34.1–31 ll. 260–261, *comm. in Gal.* lib. 3, prol. ll. 5–12, *epist.* 140.1.2; cf. Quint. *inst. orat.* 4.1.77–79, 12.10.73.

The juxtaposition of *plausus* and *clamor*, in the same case and in parallel construction, is quite common in classical literature, whether they are joined (most commonly, as here) by *et* (Cic. *Phil.* 1.36, 10.8; *divin.* 1.59; the frag. of *Pro Q. Gallio*, quoted below at 8.3; Sen. *epist.* 29.12; Phaedr. *fab.* 5.5.28; Tac. *hist.* 3.83.1), *-que* (Sil. *Pun.* 16.575; Tac. *dial.* 39.4), *atque* (Cic. *epist. ad Brut.* 1.3.2), or by asyndeton (Cic. *orat.* 236).

For the plural present participle *audientes* as a virtual substantive meaning ‘audience’, see *TLL* II vi.1280.66 ff.

*amplexetur me modo sapientia et Abisag nostra, quae numquam senescit, in meo requiescat sinu* With this conflation of Prov. 4:8c (*cum eam* [sc. *sapientiam*] *fuero amplexatus*), which was quoted earlier at 3.2, and 1 Kgs. 1:2b (*dormiatque in sinu tuo*), Jer. now brings his exegetical digression about Abishag to an effective climax by applying its results to his own situation as Nepotian’s spiritual mentor. Furthermore, both the affectionate *nostra* and the hyperbatic *requiescat* highlight Jer.’s intimate access, through his exegetical expertise, to the divine wisdom revealed in Scripture.

#### 4.2

*inpolluta est ... incorrupta est* Jer. encloses his period, by way of a ring composition, between two quadrisyllabic predicate adjectives which, because they are synonyms denoting [sexual] purity (*inpolluta*: *TLL* VII 1 v.650.10 ff.; *incorrupta*: *TLL* VII 1 vii.1035.26 ff.), constitute a pleonastic affirmation of the desirability of wisdom in Scriptural matters.

*virginitatisque perpetuae* Cf. *comm. in Am.* lib. 2, prol. ll. 10–11 *frigescente corpore*, [*senectus*] *dormit cum perpetua virgine Sunamite* (Jer.’s virginal reference has a biblical basis: in 1 Kgs. 1:2, 4 Abishag is alluded to as a *virgo*); for this same erotic oxymoron, cf. *epist.* 22.1.2 *carne contempta sponsi iungaris amplexibus*. In the short treatise *De dispositione sanctimonii*, which belongs to the late fourth or early fifth century and whose authorship is ascribed apocryphally to Paul’s disciple Titus, Abishag is called a symbol of the virgin dedicated to Christ (*quae in formam virginitatis Christi constituta est*); D. de Bruyne, “*Epistula Titi discipuli Pauli, De dispositione sanctimonii*,” *RBén* 37 (1925): 47–63 (61 ll. 545–546). This typological treatment of Abishag

nevertheless is unrelated to Jer.'s allegorical interpretation and should be located instead within the broader discourse of virginal imagery with which this writing is concerned; cf. G. Sfameni Gasparro, "*L'Epistula Titi discipuli Pauli De dispositione sanctimonii e la tradizione dell'enkrateia*," *ANRW* II.25.6 (1988): 4551–4664 (4577–4589).

*in similitudinem Mariae, cum cotidie generet semperque parturiat, incorrupta est* By means of this simile Jer. affirms Mary's perpetual virginity, one of the centerpiece doctrines of his ascetic ideology; see e.g. L. Mirri, "La verginità nel Mistero di Maria in San Gerolamo," *StudPatr* 33 (1997): 325–344. This passing reference may seem at first glance to be nothing more than a gratuitous aside. However, when we consider that the letter to Nepotian was destined for Rome in addition to its ostensible addressee's Altinum (see Introduction, "To Altinum and Beyond"), the simile may be read as Jer.'s brief vindication of this (for the time) controversial doctrine which he had staunchly defended some ten years earlier in Rome in his pamphlet against the priest Helvidius; see G. Rocca, *L'Adversus Helvidium di san Girolamo nel contesto della letteratura ascetico-mariana del secolo IV* (Berne, 1998).

*apostolum* By 'the Apostle' Jer. means none other than Paul, as the ensuing quotation from 2 Cor. 8:13–14 makes clear. This epithet for Paul, which was extremely common among Greek and Latin patristic writers (e.g. ὁ ἀπόστολος in Origen always means Paul, though in Clement of Alexandria it can sometimes refer to either Peter or John), is but one manifestation of the exalted status that Paul enjoyed in later centuries as the first and greatest of all Christian theologians and as the most recognizable apostolic face of the Gospel; see C.J. Roetzel, *Paul: The Man and the Myth* (Columbia, 1998), 152–177; M.F. Wiles, *The Divine Apostle* (Cambridge, 1967), 14–25. On Jer.'s high regard for Paul, see L.J. van der Lof, "L'apôtre Paul dans les lettres de saint Jérôme," *NT* 19 (1977): 150–160; L. Perrone, "Questioni paoline nell'epistolario di Gerolamo," in C. Moreschini and G. Menestrina (eds.), *Motivi letterari ed esegetici in Gerolamo: Atti del convegno tenuto a Trento il 5–7 dicembre 1995* (Brescia, 1997), 81–103.

*spiritu ferventes ... refrigescet caritas multorum* Jer. quotes these portions of Rom. 12:11 and Mt. 24:12, respectively, together also at *comm. in Hier.* 2.12 ll. 13–16 and *tract. in Ps. 147* ll. 168–173; cf. *epist.* 120.12.4. Olympiodorus would later do likewise in his commentary on Jeremiah (PG 93:641). In his fragmentary commentary on 1 Corinthians Origen, like Jer., links Paul's

statement with spiritual wisdom (ζέοντας τῷ πνεύματι, πλουτοῦντας λόγῳ σοφίας, in C. Jenkins, *JThS* 9 [1908]: 233).

*stultus pastor* Jer. identifies the shepherd of Zech. 11:15 (cf. Jdt. 11:19) as the Antichrist at *comm. in Hier.* 4.45 ll. 10–12 and *comm. in Zach.* 11.15–17 ll. 421–423. This identification had already been made by Didymus (*comm. in Zach.* 4.162), who may be Jer.'s most immediate source; for his reliance upon Didymus' *Commentary on Zechariah*, see A. Canellis, "L'In Zachariam de Jérôme et la tradition alexandrine," in Cain-Lössl, 153–162. Herod and other historical individuals have been proposed by interpreters both ancient and modern as candidates for the foolish shepherd (for a conspectus of opinions, see E. Merrill, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* [Chicago, 1994], 303). It is probably best, however, to see him as the symbolical representative of corrupt and diffident leaders of God's people who pursue their own desires rather than God's righteousness; see G. Klein, *Zechariah* (Nashville, 2008), 343.

*sapientia decrescente refrigescet caritas multorum* Jer. has altered his biblical source-text (Mt. 24:12 *et quoniam abundabit iniquitas refrigescet caritas multorum*) to suit the context of his discussion; he quotes or refers to this verse fifteen other times but nowhere else takes liberties with it as he does here. This is an apocalyptic passage, and Jer. appropriately has introduced it as such (*in evangelio dominum praedicasse quod in fine mundi ...*) to create a sense of urgency as he makes a statement that is subtle but nonetheless grandiose in its implications about his own role as a mediator of divine wisdom to contemporary Christians: these are perilous times, as prophesied in the Bible, and so we must take refuge in *sapientia*, the key to which is the proper interpretation of Scripture, and although it is in short supply (*sapientia decrescente*), Jer. has amply demonstrated through his Abishag excursus that he, a pious *senex*, is a latter-day guarantor of this wisdom.

#### 4.3

*beatus Cyprianus* *beatus* is Jer.'s preferred honorific for the bishop of Carthage (he uses it on sixteen other occasions); for a brief lexical history of this term's usage among Christians, see R. Braun, "La notion du bonheur dans le latin des chrétiens," *StudPatr* 10 (1970): 177–182; cf. E. Sánchez Salor, "*Sanctus, sacer y beatus*," *Durius* 4 (1976): 35–55. Jer. is unequivocally laudatory in his assessment of Cyprian's prose style (*comm. in Is.* 60.13 l. 33, *epist.* 58.10.1, 70.3.1), his writings (*epist.* 22.22.3, 66.5.4, 70.5.2, 107.12.3, 130.19.5), and his



character (*comm. in Ion.* 3.6 l. 211, *vir. ill.* 67). He also relished the bishop's sententiousness and quotes pithy sayings by him here and at *comm. in Am.* lib. 2, prol. ll. 26–27, *epist.* 30.14.2.

*“non diserta sed fortia”* If, as Jer. would later claim, Nepotian knew his Cyprian by heart (*epist.* 60.10.9), then the young priest would readily have recognized that this quotation comes from the African bishop's *Epistula ad Donatum* (2), a writing from which Jer. appropriates material on other occasions (see Cain 2009d): *cum de domino, de deo vox est, vocis pura sinceritas non eloquentiae viribus nititur ad fidei argumenta sed rebus. denique accipe non diserta, sed fortia, nec ad audientiae popularis inlecebram culto sermone fucata, sed ad divinam indulgentiam praedicandam rudi veritate simplicia*; Cyprian's *disertus-fortis* opposition, which he derived from the pages of Cicero (*de orat.* 1.231), was taken over by not only Jer. but also Ruricius of Limoges (*epist. lib. 2*, 18 *quod non tam diserta cupiunt audire quam fortia, non tantum voluptuosa quam vera*). Cyprian's apology for a defective style and his opposition of rhetorical vacuity to evangelical truth, which recalls the age-old dispute in classical antiquity between rhetoric and philosophy, is mirrored in the beginning of the present chapter, where Jer. tells Nepotian not to expect from him *pueriles declamationes, sententiarum flosculos, verborum lenocinia*. Thus, Jer., like Cyprian, overwhelmingly emphasizes substance over style and the simplicity and clarity of truth over the rhetorical speciousness and obfuscation (see also *comm. in Is.* lib. 5, prol. ll. 47–51 and lib. 8, prol. ll. 9–16, *comm. in Hiez.* lib. 5 ll. 12–15, *comm. in Am.* lib. 3, prol. ll. 55–56, *comm. in Os.* 2.16–17 ll. 428–431 and 10.13 ll. 441–444, *dial. Luc. et orth.* 14, *tract. in Ps.* 78 ll. 29–31, *epist.* 48.4.3, 140.1.2); cf. Ambrose's disclaimer about his own style in the *De officiis*: *nostra legent si volent, qui non sermonum supellectilem neque artem dicendi sed simplicem rerum exquirunt gratiam* (*off.* 1.29).

*fratrem collegio patrem senio* Cf. *epist.* 105.5.2 (to Augustine) *vale, mi amice carissime, aetate fili, dignitate parens*; see also Aug. *epist.* 166.1 *catholica pace frater, aetate filius, honore conpresbyter noster Orosius*. In his epistolary epitaph on Nepotian Jer. uses similar phraseology as he recreates the deceased's last words in such a way as to stress Nepotian's great affection for him as a spiritual director: *hanc tunicam, qua utebar in ministerio Christi, mitte dilectissimo mihi, aetate patri, fratri collegio, et, quidquid a te nepoti debebatur affectus, in illum transfer, quem mecum pariter diligebas* (*epist.* 60.13.3).

As the basis of his authority for dispensing advice to Nepotian Jer. appeals first to their equality (*fratrem*) in the ecclesiastical hierarchy (*collegio*). He also invokes his seniority in years (*patrem*), asserting that he has already

reached old age (*senio*; cf. 1.2 *nunc iam cano capite et arata fronte*). Generally speaking, the threshold of *senectus* in the Roman world was between the ages of sixty and sixty-five (cf. Aug. *div. quaest. oct. trib.* 58 *nam cum a sexagesimo anno senectus dicatur incipere ...*); see M. Finley, "The Elderly in Classical Antiquity," *G&R* 28 (1981): 156–171 (156); W. Suder, "L'initium senectutis nell'impero romano e medio evo," in *Actes des 110<sup>e</sup> congrès national des sociétés savantes* (Paris, 1987), 65–79. At the time of writing to Nepotian, Jer. was in his middle to late forties, and so he was still some years away from being considered a *senex* proper by contemporary standards. He nonetheless rhetorically fashions himself as a *senex* because, in accordance with the Greco-Roman 'wisdom in old age' *topos* on which he has elaborated so much thus far in the letter, this self-portraiture implies that he has accumulated, over the course of his purportedly long lifetime as an ascetic Christian, the experience and knowledge necessary to provide expert guidance to neophyte priests and monks. Jer.'s self-portraiture has an additional nuance: the word with which he describes his age, *senium*, is a pejorative synonym of *senectus/senecta* that connotes debility and decrepitude. Furthermore, by his very act of assuming responsibility for Nepotian's spiritual rearing Jer. was fulfilling a conventional socio-cultural role, in that senior citizens who were acknowledged experts in a given field were encouraged to pass on their wisdom to the next generation; cf. Cokayne, 94–104, and see e.g. Cic. *senect.* 28–29; Ov. *fast.* 5.57–64, 69–74; Plut. *moral.* 796b, with S. Byl, 'Plutarque et la vieillesse', *LEC* 45 (1977): 107–123.

The *senex sapiens* construct, so masterfully deployed in the letter to Nepotian, was not the only literary *persona* in Jer.'s rhetorical repertory. For instance, in 412 he portrayed himself as a seasoned sailor able to help the Gallic monk Rusticus navigate the stormy seas of the monastic life so as to avoid shipwreck (*epist.* 125.2.3; on seafaring imagery in Jer., see J.W. Smit, *Studies on the Language and Style of Columba the Younger (Columbanus)* [Amsterdam, 1971], 172–189), and two years later he figured himself as a new Moses who would lead the virgin Demetrias into the spiritual Promised Land (*epist.* 130.19.6, with Cain 2009a, 162).

*ab incunabulis fidei* For this metaphor, cf. Cic. *orat.* 1.23 *ab incunabulis nostrae ... doctrinae*; Jer. *epist.* 60.10.1 *incunabula quaedam nascentis fidei*, 77.2.2 *de conversionis ac paenitentiae incunabulis*, 125.8.2 *nunc monachi incunabula moresque discutimus*.

*usque ad perfectam ... aetatem* Jer.'s assertion that he will escort Nepotian to the point of spiritual perfection presupposes of course that he himself has

already attained such maturity, and to temper the implied arrogance of this suggestion he refers to himself in the third person (*ducat ... erudiat*) rather than in the more direct first-person voice. Hilberg missed the faint allusion to Eph. 4:13 (*donec occurramus omnes in unitatem fidei et agnitionis filii dei in virum perfectum, in mensuram aetatis plenitudinis Christi*).

*per singulos gradus* Jer. underscores the incremental nature of the monastic journey that lies ahead for Nepotian (Basil stresses the same progression by degrees at *epist.* 42.2), and thus his need for meticulous spiritual navigation, using a word (*gradus*) which evokes the individual stages of promotion within the ecclesiastical *cursus honorum* (on this technical meaning, see Gryson, 127–128), and indeed Pope Siricius had employed the phrase *per gradus singulos* in a decretal to Bishop Himerius of Tarragona some eight years earlier to describe gradual progression through the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Nepotian certainly was very familiar with this concept and the marked meaning of *gradus* from his own ascent through the clerical ranks (cf. *epist.* 60.10.3 *per solitos gradus presbyter ordinatur*).

*vivendi praecepta* See on 1.1 *praecepta vivendi*.

*in te ceteros erudiat* The demographic subset envisaged by “the others” (cf. *OLD* sv *ceterus* 2a) is classically educated and monastically inclined clergymen like Nepotian, i.e. those with whom the writing’s intensely erudite style and ascetic-themed message would resonate. Jer.’s stated expectation that his treatise will have a broader impact is a cue to Nepotian to assume an active role in disseminating it (at *epist.* 60.11.2 he claims that Nepotian eagerly showed this writing to friends and new acquaintances). Jer. discloses his anticipation of an indefinitely wide readership also at the end of the letter, where he pre-emptively defends this work against the carping of critics (17.1–2).

#### 4.4

*beato Heliodoro* In the opening to the letter (1.1) Jer. referred to Nepotian’s uncle as *sanctus Heliodorus*, but now he opts for another honorific (*beatus*) applied primarily to bishops (O’Brien, 93). For Heliodorus’ prosopography, see on 1.1 *Heliodorum*.

*qui nunc pontifex Christi est* In the fourth and fifth centuries *pontifex* was used of both priests and bishops (see Hübner, nos. 65, 88, 115; Mohrmann,

4.99–100; P. Stockmeier, “Die Übernahme des Pontifex-Titels im spätantiken Christentum,” in *Konzil und Papst* [Munich, 1975], 75–84) and of emperors in the fifth and sixth centuries (P. Batiffol, “*Pontifex*,” *BSAF* [1926]: 222–227); on its synonymity with *episcopus* in patristic usage, see F. van Haeperen, “Des pontifes païens aux pontifes chrétiens: transformation d’un titre: entre pouvoirs et représentations,” *RBPh* 81 (2003): 137–159. Jer. calls the bishop *pontifex Christi* also at *epist.* 69.9.7, 82.11.4, 97.2.3, 108.6.1, and below at 9.3 and 10.3.

*normamque vitae eius exemplum habere virtutum* Jer. later said of Nepotian: *avunculum pontificem deserere non audebat, tota in illo cernens exempla virtutum domique habens unde disceret* (*epist.* 60.10.2–3). Cf. *epist.* 24.1.2 *igitur Asellae nostrae vita breviter explicanda est ... his potius, quae adulescentulae sunt, legere dignare, ut ad exemplum eius se instituentes conversationem illius perfectae vitae normam arbitrentur*, 54.11.2 *habes sanctum Exsuperium probatae aetatis et fidei, qui te monitis suis frequenter instituat*, 123.10.1 *habes aviam, matrem, amitam, quarum tibi abundans imitatio atque doctrina et praecepta vivendi norma virtutum est*. See also Athan. v. *Ant.*, prol. 3 ἔστι γὰρ μοναχοῖς ἱκανὸς χαρακτήρ πρὸς ἄσκησιν ὁ Ἀντωνίου βίος.

*nostra qualiacumque sunt suscipe* Jer. ostensibly demeans his letter with the typically self-deprecatory *qualiacumque* (cf. *OLD* sv *qualiscumque* 1c, e.g. ‘for what it is worth’), and with similar affectation he later downplayed its significance (*epist.* 60.11.2 *quidquid minus in opusculo erat ...*); cf. e.g. *comm. in Hiez.* 11.39 ll. 2107–2108 *afferentes qualiacumque sunt nostra*, *ibid.* lib. 12, prol. ll. 32–33 *quae nostra qualiacumque fuerint libenter accipis*, *epist.* 119.1.1 *haec, qualiacumque sunt, dictare compellor*; see also Stat. *silv.*, praef. 2 *haec qualiacumque sunt, Melior carissime, si tibi non displicuerint*.

*libellum hunc libello illius copulato* This compact but nonetheless rhetorically impressive passage is marked by pronounced labial alliteration (initial-sequent, initial-interior, and initial-interrupted) and polyptotic antanaclassis (i.e. *libellum* used literally, and *libello* figuratively). *libellum hunc* corresponds to *Epistula* 52, while *libello illius* refers presumably not to a literal treatise penned by Heliodorus for Nepotian’s benefit but rather, in a metaphorical sense, to Heliodorus’ exemplary life (cf. above *normamque vitae eius exemplum habere virtutum*). For the closely related notion of the preacher’s mode of life being like a sermon in itself, cf. Aug. *doctr. chr.* 4.29 *sit eius quasi copia dicendi forma vivendi*; Greg. Naz. *orat.* 21.37 (on Athanasius) ζήσας δὲ οὕτω, καὶ παιδευθεὶς καὶ παιδεύσας, ὥστε ὅρον μὲν

ἐπισκοπῆς εἶναι τὸν ἐκείνου βίον καὶ τρόπον, νόμον δὲ ὀρθοδοξίας τὰ ἐκείνου δόγματα.

After having declared his right to be Nepotian's spiritual guide (*audi fratrem collegio patrem senio*), Jer. now makes a point to not be unilaterally authoritarian and presents his advising of the young priest as a collaborative effort between Heliodorus and himself. This is not simply a nod to his own longtime friendship with Heliodorus, though it doubtless is that as well. Even more so it is a conscientious gesture of deference to Heliodorus' pastoral authority as a bishop, for the inevitable fact remained that Heliodorus not only outranked Jer. in the church hierarchy, but he also was the diocesan bishop to whom Nepotian directly reported. Jer.'s personal history with Heliodorus notwithstanding, he was bound by contemporary ecclesiastical convention to respect hierarchical protocol, even though he would later claim that he finally decided to write to Nepotian after this latter had asked his uncle to make the request for him (*epist.* 60.11.1). Jer. made deferential gestures to ecclesiastical authorities local to other Christian correspondents so as not to appear to undermine the sovereignty of the former: the priest Alethius of Cahors (*epist.* 121, prol. 4 *habes ibi sanctum virum Alethium presbyterum, qui ... possit solvere, quae requiris*), Bishop Proculus of Marseille (*epist.* 125.20.2 *sanctum doctissimumque pontificem Proculum, qui viva et praesenti voce nostras scidulas superet cotidianisque tractatibus iter tuum dirigat*), and Bishop Augustine of Hippo (*epist.* 126.1.3 *certe habes ibi virum sanctum et eruditum Augustinum episcopum, qui ... docere te poterit*). Even if Jer. had been a bishop rather than a priest, the same principle would apply, for even bishops were expected not to interfere with their episcopal colleagues' administration of their respective diocesan jurisdictions (cf. Aug. *epist.* 34.5, *bapt.* 2.2.3; see Gaudemet, 115–117).

*ut cum ille te monachum erudierit, hic clericum doceat esse perfectum* ille = Heliodorus' exemplary life (cf. *libello illius*; see previous n.) and *hic* = *epist.* 52 (cf. *libellum hunc*). This declaration of authorial intention comes as a surprise. Jer. does allude above to his presbyterial status (*audi fratrem collegio*), but it is his experience as a veteran ascetic, announced with rhetorical fanfare in 1.1 and elaborated upon from there up until 4.2 (i.e. his youthful monastic training in the 'desert' translated into the wisdom of old age), in which he fundamentally grounds his authority as Nepotian's spiritual advisor. If anything, the reader expects Jer. to provide instruction in how to be a monk, and Heliodorus, a bishop (*qui nunc pontifex Christi est*), to teach his nephew the clerical ropes, not least because instruction of the lower clergy traditionally was the prerogative of the bishop; see e.g. R. Beaver, "August-

tine of Hippo, *servus servorum Christi*," *ChH* 3 (1934): 187–206 (193–194). Yet these anticipated roles are reversed, with an ironic result: Heliodorus, who is indirectly reprimanded in 1.1 for having given up prematurely on the eremitical life (i.e. Jer. complains about Heliodorus abandoning him [*quae deserti sodalis monstraret affectum*]), is now charged with fielding Nepotian's questions about the monastic life, while Jer., who was a priest more in name than in fact and had all but shunned his clerical duties since his ordination in c.377 in Antioch by Bishop Paulinus (see Cain 2009, 116, 147), presumes to teach Nepotian how best to live out his clerical vocation and indeed how to be a *clericus perfectus* (he emphasizes the promised salutary effects of his tutorship by concluding the sentence with the climactic *perfectum*).

### Chapter 5

With this chapter Jer. formally opens the paraenetic core of his letter which runs through the end of ch. 16. He begins by linking the ecclesiastical term *clericus* ('clergyman') to its Greek derivative κληρος ('lot'), and on the basis of this etymology he argues that the clergyman, because he is himself the 'lot' of the Lord, has a duty to abide by a strict ascetic ethic. Half of the chapter is concerned with Nepotian's conduct around women. In particular, Jer. gives a set of directives regarding the house-calls that the young priest makes to the homes of female parishioners.

#### 5.1

*igitur* For the sense of the conjunction here, cf. on 3.1 *igitur*.

*qui Christi servit ecclesiae* The relative clause has a causal sense ("because he ministers to the church of Christ"): i.e. by virtue of his office he has an obligation to know whence he is called a clergyman in the first place. The implication seems to be that without knowing the meaning of the word *clericus* no clergyman can completely grasp the true import of his calling. By imposing this precondition which he proceeds to satisfy with an etymological derivation (see following n.), Jer. subtly positions himself as the gatekeeper, as it were, of the inner sanctum of knowledge about the clerical vocation.

*vocabulum ... nominis* Jer. alternates between the *vocabulum* and *nomen*, which he uses synonymously, for the sake of lexical *variatio*, as he does also at e.g. *comm. in Is.* 63.2 l. 6 and *hebr. quaest. in Gen.* p. 44 Lagarde.

*si* Since the underlying premise of the condition is assumed by Jer. to be true (i.e. he affirms the validity of his etymology), *si* may be rendered as 'inasmuch as' (cf. *OLD* sv *si* 12).

κληρος *Graece 'sors' Latine appellatur* Jer. commences his discussion from first principles, by defining his terminology. This etymological notice not only sets an erudite tone for his discourse from its very inception, but it also reinforces the same point about the utility of philological insights for the intellectual and spiritual well-being of the Christian that he made during the course of his allegorization of the figure of Abishag, an interpretation he studiously grounded in Hebrew philology (3.7–9). Jer.'s etymological expla-

nation of the ‘clergy’ (*clerus*) as being the *sors* (or *pars*) *domini*, and what this really implies about clergymen’s unique connection with divinity that laymen do not share, had an enormous influence on the medieval development of the notion of the exclusivity of the clergy; see W. Ullmann, “The Papacy and the Faithful,” in *Gouvernés et gouvernants* (Brussels, 1963), 7–45 (29–30). In a letter to his Milanese clergy Ambrose seems to imply that his clerical addressees are aware of this etymological derivation (*epist.* 4.17.13–14).

The MSS are divided as to the form of κληρος, i.e. whether it should appear in its Greek characters or as transliterated into Latin. Like Hilberg, I have retained the former because it is the more likely of the two to have been present in Jer.’s archetype. On bilingual Latin authors (including Jer.) being more apt to write Greek words in Greek characters than to transliterate them, see A. Pelttari, “Approaches to the Writing of Greek in Late Antique Latin Texts,” *GRBS* 51 (2011): 461–482.

*sors, id est pars* This gloss anticipates an orderly transition to the quotation below of Ps. 72:26b (*pars mea dominus*). Augustine stopped short of making this connection between *sors* and *pars* and instead accounted for how the word *clerus* acquired the meaning of *sors* by tracing it to Matthias’ election to the college of apostles by lot (*enarr. in Ps.* 67 19; cf. Acts 1:17, 26); Isidore (*eccl. off.* 2.1.1) quotes Augustine’s words verbatim on this point but fails to identify his source.

*vel ... vel* “Both ... and”; see on 1.1 *vel ... vel*.

## 5.2

*qui dominum possidet et cum propheta dicit: ‘pars mea dominus’, nihil extra dominum habere potest* I.e. the clergyman, if he truly is to have the Lord as his portion, must have no money or material possessions to call his own. Jer.’s phraseology *pars mea dominus* is derived from Vulg. Lam. 3.24a, but his argument is based upon an ascetic interpretation of Num. 18:20, where the Lord says that the Levites will inherit no land in Israel because he will be their portion and inheritance (*in terra eorum nihil possidebitis nec habebitis partem inter eos; ego pars et hereditas tua in medio filiorum Israel*) (cf. Dt. 10:9, 12:12; Sir. 45:27; see also Philo *spec. leg.* 1.131, 156); for the prevalence of this ascetic reading among patristic authors, see Clark, 110. Jer. quotes Ps. 72:26b (*pars mea dominus*) in connection with his spiritualization of the Levites as types of self-dispossessing Christians also at *epist.* 118.4.3 (*ut dominum mundi in possessione habeas, ut possis canere cum propheta:*



*"pars mea dominus", ut verus Levita nihil de terrae hereditate possideas*); cf. *comm. in Is.* 57.6 ll. 24–26, *adv. Iov.* 2.34. At *fug. saec.* 2.7 Ambrose, drawing from the same OT imagery, applies this notion to family renunciation: one who has God as his portion should care for nothing except God, even if this means relinquishing close familial ties. Julian Pomerius (*v. cont.* 2.16.2) uses phraseology similar to Jer.'s as he discusses the single-minded devotion owed to God by the clergyman: *proinde quem possidendi delectat ambitio, deum, qui possidet omnia quae creavit, expedita mente possideat, et in eo habebit quaecunque habere sancte desiderat. sed quoniam nemo possidet deum nisi qui possidetur a deo, sit ipse primitus dei possessio et efficietur ei deus possessor et portio.*

*si aurum, si argentum, si possessiones, si variam supellectilem* This fourfold asyndetic anaphora, the implied verb governing each of which is *habuerit* from the previous sentence, enables Jer. to make his point about priestly avarice with more flair than otherwise. At *hom. de pers. Christ.* ll. 14–15 he lists the first three of these items (in the same order) as being inimicable to the monk who has renounced material things; cf. *epist.* 22.31.1 *aliena nobis auri argentique sunt pondera, nostra possessio spiritalis est*, 22.36.3 *non dicam aurum et argentum et ceteras opes, sed ipsam terram caelumque despicias et Christo copulata cantabis: "pars mea dominus"* (on Jer.'s disdain for the accumulation of wealth, see further Antin, 311–319).

In Jer. *supellectilis* takes this same adjectival modifier (*varia*) also at *comm. in Hiez.* 8.27.23–24a l. 1315, *ibid.* 9.29.17–21 ll. 952–953, *comm. in Naum* 2.8–9 l. 282, *epist.* 53.6.2. *supellectilis* here refers collectively to "decorative" (*varia*) and therefore costly home furnishings, but Jer. probably has furniture specifically in mind. Tables, chairs, and couches were the most standard types of furniture in the upper-class Roman home. They derived their value not only from the sophistication of the craftsmanship that went into manufacturing them but also from the rarity of their constituent materials. Luxury furniture items made from precious commodities such as silver, gold, ivory, ebony, marble, and choice woods (e.g. *citrus*, cypress, cedar), were important markers of high socio-economic status in the Roman world (e.g. at *comm. in Hiez.* 9.29.17–21 ll. 952–953 Jer. says that ownership of *supellectilis varia* is one of the determinants of *nobilitas*). Thus, the monastic clergyman who claims to have the Lord as his sole possession and yet owns, or even just longs to own, expensive furniture is nothing more than an impostor and disgrace to his holy profession. Hence Jer.'s satiric depiction, composed a decade prior to writing to Nepotian, of the worldly Roman priest who frequently visits the homes of the well-to-do and covets their exquisite home furnishings: *si*

*pulvillum viderit, si mantele elegans, si aliquid domesticae suppellectilis, laudat, miratur, adtrectat et se his indigere conquerens non tam inpetrat quam extorquet* (*epist.* 22.28.5). On the materials, craftsmanship, and economic significance of fine furniture in Roman society, see J. Liversidge, "Furniture and Interior Decoration," in A.L.F. Rivet (ed.), *The Roman Villa in Britain* (London, 1969), 127–172; S.T.A.M. Mols, *Wooden Furniture in Herculaneum: Form, Technique and Function* (Amsterdam, 1999); G.M.A. Richter, *The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans* (London, 1966).

*si autem ego pars domini sum et funiculus hereditatis eius* A verbal reminiscence of Vulg. Dt. 32.9 *pars autem domini populus eius Iacob funiculus hereditatis eius*.

*nec accipio partem inter ceteras tribus sed quasi Levita et sacerdos vivo de decimis et altari serviens altaris oblatione sustentor* A conflation of Dt. 18:1 (*non habebunt sacerdotes et Levitae et omnes qui de eadem tribu sunt partem et hereditatem cum reliquo Israhel quae sacrificia domini et oblationes eius comedent*) and 1 Cor. 9:13–14 (*nescitis quoniam qui in sacrario operantur quae de sacrario sunt edunt qui altario deserviunt cum altario participantur ita et dominus ordinavit his qui evangelium adnuntiant de evangelio vivere*). Julian Pomerius (*v. cont.* 2.14) also cites this Pauline text as Scriptural justification for the clergyman being supported by the church, and Origen (*Ledegang*, 326–327), Gregory of Nyssa (*epist.* 17.7), and Augustine (*Poss. v. Aug.* 23.2) agree that his income should come from this source. Ambrose (*off.* 1.152) says that priests who are financially self-sufficient ought to live off their own money and not off church funds (cf. *Jul. Pom. v. cont.* 2.10.1–2).

Jer. is not saying that the priest should draw his income from tithes; tithing, after all, does not seem to have become a standard practice in urban churches until the late fifth century. Rather, he is using OT language metaphorically to argue that the priest should have a share in the church's revenue (see Finn, 49–50), the two principal sources of which in the fourth century were rents from properties bequeathed by wealthy benefactors and offertory gifts donated by the congregation. Jer.'s prescription is rather unrealistic in view of the contemporary socio-ecclesiastical situation. It is true that priests in the wealthy churches of e.g. Rome could expect to live without much worry on their ecclesiastical *salarium*, which would have been stable despite being subject to periodic fluctuations depending upon the revenue stream of the diocese. The same could probably be said also for Nepotian, who served a church in a prosperous city (Altinum), which was

a minor center for textile production in Late Antiquity; see G. Cresci Marone and M. Tirelli (eds.), *Produzioni, merci e commerci in Altino preromana e romana* (Rome, 2003). However, priests serving churches in small provincial towns throughout the Empire were not always so fortunate. In fact, many received such paltry stipends that they had no choice but to continue practicing their secular occupations (e.g. carpentry, money-lending, masonry) alongside their sacerdotal ministry; for the abundant primary-source evidence for the East, see G. Schmelz, *Kirchliche Amtsträger im spätantiken Ägypten nach den Aussagen der griechischen und koptischen Papyri und Ostraka* (Munich, 2002), 232–241. On clerical salaries in Late Antiquity, see further A.H.M. Jones, “Church Finance in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries,” *JThS* n.s. 11 (1960): 84–94; M. Réveillaud, “Pastorat et salariat au cours des premiers siècles de l’Église,” *ETHR* 41 (1966): 27–41; G. Scöllgen, *Die Anfänge der Professionalisierung des Klerus und das kirchliche Amt in der Syrischen Didaskalie* (Münster, 1998), 34–100.

*habens victum et vestitum his contentus ero* Jer. quotes or alludes to 1Tim. 6:8 on over a dozen other occasions in his works, in most cases as a biblical proof-text for monastic poverty or to condemn avarice (at *epist.* 69.9.2 it is applied specifically to clerical poverty). At *epist.* 53.11.3, evoking this verse, he says that food and clothing constitute the Christian’s *divitiae*; cf. Greg. Nys. v. *Macr.* 11, 29, v. *Greg. Thaum.* pp. 6, 25 Heil; Greg. Naz. *orat.* 18.8, 43.60; Nil. Anc. *orat. in Albian.* (PG 79:709). At *comm. in Tit.* 1.6–7 ll. 462–464, as in the present case, he quotes 1Tim. 6:8 in conjunction with 1Cor. 9:13 (see previous n.) to stress that the clergyman must possess nothing but the bare necessities supplied to him by the church (cf. Jul. Pom. v. *cont.* 2.10.2, 2.11). Basil, too, maintains that the clergy should not possess more than is absolutely necessary; see *reg. mor.* 47, 48, 70, with K. Koschorke, *Spuren der alten Liebe: Studien zum Kirchenbegriff des Basilios von Caesarea* (Freiburg, 1991), 214–215.

*nudam crucem nudus sequar* Jer. was exceedingly fond of using the figure of antanaclassis (cf. Lausberg, § 663) with the adjective *nudus*. See *epist.* 58.2.1 *nudam crucem nudus sequens*, 108.13.1 *super nudam humum nudus*, 120.1.12 *nudam solamque virtutem nuda sequaris et sola*, 125.20.5 *nudum Christum nudus sequere*, 145.1 *imitare Ioseph et Aegyptiae dominae pallium derelinque, ut nudus sequaris dominum salvatorem*; cf. 108.15.7 *pauperem dominum pauper spiritu sequebatur*; note Asterius’ imitation of Jer. at *ad Ren.* 7.17: *Christum pauperem pauperior famulus prosequatur, nudum nudus inquirat*. The arresting formulation *nudus nudum Christum sequi* enjoyed great popularity as a

slogan for monastic spirituality during the Middle Ages; see M. Bernards, “*Nudus nudum Christum sequi*,” *WW* 14 (1951): 148–151; J. Châtillon, “*Nudum Christum nudus sequere*: A Note on the Origins and Meaning of the Theme of Spiritual Nakedness in the Writings of St. Bonaventure,” in *S. Bonaventura 1274–1974* (Grottaferrata, 1973), 4.719–772; G. Constable, “*Nudus nudum Christum sequi* and Parallel Formulas in the Twelfth Century: A Supplementary Dossier,” in F. Forrester Church and T. George (eds.), *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History* (Leiden, 1979), 83–91; R. Grégoire, “L’adage ascétique *Nudus nudum Christum sequi*,” in *Studi storici in onore di Ottorino Bertolini* (Pisa, 1972), 1.395–409; F. Mormando, “*Nudus nudum Christum sequi*: The Franciscans and Differing Interpretations of Male Nakedness in Fifteenth-century Italy,” *FCS* 33 (2008): 171–197. Contrary to popular scholarly belief, as expressed in many of the aforementioned studies, the formulation in question originated not with Jer., whom scholars have overwhelmingly credited with its creation, but rather with Lactantius, from whom Jer. took over this phraseology (see Cain 2010b).

### 5.3

*obsecro itaque te et repetens iterum iterumque monebo* An adaptation of Virg. *Aen.* 3.436 *praedicam et repetens iterumque iterumque monebo* (Heleneus exhorts Aeneas to remember to pay his proper respects to Juno). Jer. replaces the Virgilian *praedicam* with *obsecro itaque te* and drops the enclitic *-que* from the first *iterum* to make the passage sound more prosaic, but retains the repetitive *iterum* for emphasis. He dispenses with *-que* also at *apol. c. Ruf.* 1.31, but at *epist.* 130.7.12 he quotes the line in its totality; cf. Hagendahl, 182, 192, 257, 278, 300, 307. Jer.’s evocation of it here, in addition serving as yet another classical garnish for his prose, lends a certain gravity to his injunction to Nepotian to remain true to his monastic poverty. This Virgilian verse enjoyed a robust *fortuna* and was quoted or adapted by a number of later poets and prose writers besides Jer.; see e.g. Stat. *Theb.* 10.133; Quint. *inst. orat.* 2.13.8; Lact. *op. dei* 1.5; Iuvenc. *evang. lib.* 3.665; Proba *cent.* 492; Paul. Nol. *epist.* 8.5.

*ne officium clericatus genus antiquae militiae putes, id est, ne lucra saeculi in Christi quaeras militia* The fourth-declension noun *clericatus* is a Christian neologism first attested in the fourth century (cf. *TLL* III vi.1338.78 ff.). It occurs thirty-five times in Augustine, eight other times in Jer., and not at all in Ambrose (cf. Gryson, 97n1). Here it is paired with *officium*, which encompasses the totality of the clergyman’s ministerial obligations; at 15.1 [*bis*] this

word has the same sense. Jer. again uses the phrase *officium clericatus* below at 5.6 (*si propter officium clericatus ...*).

Jer. stylishly juxtaposes the secular *militia* (i.e. the civil service) in which Nepotian had served for a time prior to becoming a priest (see on 1.1 *saeculi militia*), and the *militia Christi* (Ambrose, too, contrasts the secular *officium* and the clerical *officium*; see *off.* 1.25–29, 175). This latter was a popular metaphor for the monastic (and clerical; cf. Gaudemet, 131–133) life in the patristic period and in Jer.'s works in particular (see e.g. *epist.* 58.1.3, 60.9.2, 65.10.1, 125.9.3); see e.g. J. Capmany, *Miles Christi en la espiritualidad de san Cipriano* (Barcelona, 1956); J. Leclercq, “*Militare deo dans la tradition patristique et monastique*,” in *Militia Christi e crociata nei secoli XI–XIII* (Milan, 1992), 3–18; G. Luongo, “*Desertor Christi miles*,” *Koinonia* 2 (1978): 71–91; S. Pricoco, “*Militia Christi nelle regole monastiche latine*,” in *Mélanges M. Naldini* (Rome, 1994), 547–558; for the prevalence of the *militia Christi* motif on early Christian sarcophagi, see C. Pietri, ‘Le Serment du soldat chrétien’, *MEFRA* 74 (1962): 649–664. For some other examples of the antithesis between the secular and sacred *militia*, see Paul. Nol. *epist.* 25.8 *commuta in melius militiam saeculi, ut aeterno regi incipias militare*; Aug. *conf.* 8.6, *epist.* 151.8; John Cass. *coll.* 4.21.

In his secular occupation Nepotian had had access to various opportunities for advancement and financial remuneration (cf. Jones, 572–586), but Jer. bars him from thinking in these self-serving terms in his new profession. A very similar concern underlay Pope Siricius' decree that former officials in the secular government (*cingulo militiae saecularis astricti*) be barred from entering the ranks of the clergy (Sir. *epist.* 6.1.3; PL 13:1165): he feared that their former occupations had instilled in them a sense of entitlement and thirst for socio-economic distinction. Disinterest in money-making is one of the fundamental qualifications set down for clergymen in the NT (1 Tim. 3:8; 2 Tim. 2:4; Tit. 1:7, 11; 1 Pet. 5:2) and subapostolic literature (e.g. Polyc. *epist. ad Php.* 6.1, 11.1). Ambrose repeatedly emphasizes that priests should not be concerned with monetary gain or the accumulation of wealth (*off.* 1.28, 184, 246; 2.67, 133; 3.9; cf. Paul. Mil. v. *Ambr.* 41.1; see also Gryson, 301–305). Jer. reiterates this point elsewhere in the letter to Nepotian (5.4, 6.2, 9.1–2) and also at *comm. in Tit.* 1.6–7 ll. 456–457, 464–465, *epist.* 69.9.2. Later theorists on clerical *officia* such as Gregory the Great (*reg. past.* 1.8) and Isidore of Seville (*eccl. off.* 2.2.1), emphasize it as well; cf. Greg. Naz. *orat.* 21.9; John Chrys. *sacerd.* 4.1–2; John Cass. *coll.* 4.20; Syn. Cyr. *epist.* 5 δς δ' ἂν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν προστησάμενος αὐξή βαλάντιον ... οὗτός ἐστιν ὃν ἡμεῖς συνόδου Χριστιανῶν ἐκκηρύττομεν. At *orat.* 2.8 Gregory of Nazianzus cynically surmises that those who use their church office for financial gain far outnumber honest clergy-

men and asserts that he decided to enter the ranks of the church so that he could do his part to correct their abuses. One potentially lucrative source of revenue for the dishonest clergyman was the selling of church offices, on which, see S. Huebner, "Currencies of Power: The Venality of Offices in the Later Roman Empire," in Cain-Lenski, 167–179. Another was embezzlement: e.g. Augustine's episcopal colleague Paul of Cataquas undrewrote his extravagant lifestyle by swindling funds from his own church, committing tax evasion, and purchasing real estate through fraudulent means (*epist.* 85.2, 96.2).

*ne plus habeas quam quando clericus esse coepisti* In this respect, as in so many others (see e.g. on 5.7 *caveto ... devita*, 9.3 *sed ... est*, 15.2 *consolutores ... noverint*), Jer. later presented Nepotian, after his death, as the embodiment of his precepts in *Epistula* 52: *sint ditiores monachi quam fuerant saeculares, possideant opes sub Christo paupere quas sub locuplete diabolo non habuerant ... Nepotianus noster aurum calcans scedulas consecatur* (*epist.* 60.11.3). Cf. his high praise for Exsuperius, the monastic bishop of Toulouse, and clergymen like him *quos sacerdotium et humiliores facit et pauperiores* (*epist.* 125.20.5). Augustine (*serm.* 356.13) says that he refuses to wear *pretiosae vestes* routinely gifted to him by members of his congregation because he does not want to give the impression that he has more money now as a bishop than he did prior to taking holy orders. For diatribes against secularized monks who are wealthier now than they ever were in their former lives in the 'world', see Jer. *epist.* 125.16.1 (cf. 130.7.2); John Cass. *coll.* 4.20.

The last three words of this passage mirror Jer.'s phraseology at 1.1 (*coeperit esse ... clericus*). For the word *clericus*, see on 1.1 *clericus*.

*cleri eorum non proderunt eis* Jer. adopts the LXX reading of Jer. 12:13b (οἱ κληροὶ αὐτῶν οὐκ ὠφελήσουσιν αὐτούς). At *comm. in Hier.* 3.11 ll. 15–22 and *comm. in Am.* 8.4–6 ll. 102–111 he likewise applies this verset to rapacious clerics and thus takes the passage out of context: it refers to the desolation that will visit the vegetation in Israel on account of God's wrath at his people (L. Allen, *Jeremiah: A Commentary* [Louisville, 2008], 153).

*mensulam tuam pauperes et peregrini et cum illis Christus conviva noverit* This injunction is based loosely upon Christ's teaching that his followers should feed the hungry and show hospitality to the stranger (see Mt. 25:35).

This is the only time in all of his extant works that Jer. employs the relatively uncommon diminutive *mensula* (cf. *TLL* VIII v.757.77 ff.). Here this diminutive, like the word *hospitulum* describing Nepotian's habitation (see

on 5.4 *hospitiolum tuum*), has an ascetic connotation (as it does also at Paul. Nol. *epist.* 15.4, 19.4, 23.7), the aim of which is simultaneously to accentuate the table's strictly utilitarian function (i.e. it is not simply a decorative show-piece along the lines of the *mensa* parodied by Seneca at *tranqu. anim.* 1.7) and to eliminate the possibility of gastronomic variety and excess from Jer.'s portraiture of the idealized priest (cf. below at 6.3, for his criticism of clerical gourmandise). Nepotian, then, must neither serve sumptuous fare in his home nor throw lavish dinner parties, which in the Roman world usually were associated with gluttony and drunkenness and which therefore were to be shunned by Christian clergymen (cf. Ambr. *off.* 1.86). His only dinner companions should be the poor (see on 3.2 *defensio pauperum*) and strangers, e.g. out-of-town travelers (see on 3.2 *peregrinorum susceptio*); cf. Paul. Nol. *carm.* 16.287–289, who says that St. Felix's only dinner guests were the poor. That the priest (or bishop) should show hospitality to all in need, and especially to these two groups of people, is emphasized elsewhere by Jer. (*comm. in Tit.* 1.8–9 ll. 474–579) as well as by Cyprian (*epist.* 7.2), Ambrose (*off.* 1.39, 86, 2.103, 107, 109; 2.126–127, *epist. ext. coll.* 14.105), Chrysostom (*sacerd.* 3.16), and Julian Pomerius (*v. cont.* 1.25.1). Nepotian is said to have excelled at offering hospitality and succoring the poor (*epist.* 60.10.5); Possidius makes a similar claim about Augustine (*v. Aug.* 22.2, 6). Chrysostom likewise says that Bishop Flavian was so generous in hosting strangers that his home was even said to belong to them (*hom. 1 in Gen.* [PG 54:585]). Theodoret praises Abraham the monastic bishop of Carrhae, who while he adopted a very severe ascetic regimen for himself nevertheless was extraordinarily generous to the strangers he hosted, giving them the finest wine he could procure and meals with choice fish and vegetables (*hist. rel.* 17.7).

*negotiatorem clericum* Jer.'s usage of the substantive *clericus* indicates that he is forbidding not only priests like Nepotian but also all those who have taken holy orders (from lectors to bishops; see on 1.1 *clericus*) from engaging in commercial ventures for profit. Such proscriptions are made also by Cyprian (*epist.* 1.1.2), Ambrosiaster (*quaest. vet. et nov. test.* 46.1, *comm. in 2 Tim.* 2:4 p. 302), Ambrose (*off.* 1.185, 2.67), Chrysostom (*sacerd.* 6.4, *subintr.* 6), and Julian Pomerius (*v. cont.* 1.13.2, 1.21.1); cf. Max. Tur. *serm.* 26 *si enim non contentus stipendiis fuerit, quae de altario domino iubente consequitur, sed exercet mercimonia intercessionem vendit viduarum munera libenter amplectitur, hic negotiator magis potest videri quam clericus*. Some priests and others in the clerical ranks, especially those serving poor churches in provincial towns, had no choice but to continue practicing their secular trades in order to supplement their ecclesiastical *stipendia* (see on 5.2 *nec ... sustentor*). But

since *negotiatorem clericum* is unambiguously polemical (i.e. it is syntactically subordinate to the incendiary *quasi quandam pestem fuge*) and since it forms the first leaf of a triptych of antitheses devoted to opportunists (*negotiatorem clericum et ex inope divitem et ex ignobili gloriosum*), Jer. has in mind presumably not these small-town clergymen who are employed on the side just to make a living wage but rather those who pursue money-making ventures for the sole purpose of enriching themselves. It may be noted that Jer. here curiously fails to address at all this widespread problem of churchmen needing supplemental incomes. According to his rather unrealistic vision for the ascetic clergy, priests *should* be able to subsist (i.e. possess the basic necessities of food and clothing) solely on their meager church salary.

*ex inope divitem* The *inopes* were the poorest of the poor in Roman society (see Grodzynski, 146–152), and so the suggestion that a destitute pauper could not only attain the clerical office but also use it to propel himself into riches (cf. Jer. *epist.* 40.2.2) seems at first glance to verge on satiric absurdity. Yet Jer.'s provocative statement cannot be dismissed out of hand as being completely ungrounded in contemporary reality. For even slaves, who constituted the lowest 'class' in late Roman society, could and did rise through the clerical ranks—one such man was in fact a priest in Jer.'s monastery in Bethlehem (see Jer. *epist.* 82.6.2)—provided that they be manumitted freedmen by the time of ordination (see Gaudemet, 136–140); on slaves as clerical candidates, see further E. Jonkers, "Das Verhalten der Alten Kirche hinsichtlich der Ernennung zum Priester von Sklaven, Freigelassenen und Curiales," *Mnemosyne* 10 (1992): 286–302. Indeed, many clergymen in the western provinces of the late Empire were recruited from the lower (and middle) classes of their local communities; see S. Huebner, *Der Klerus in der Gesellschaft des spätantiken Kleinasien* (Stuttgart, 2005), 124–128; J.-U. Krause, "Überlegungen zur Sozialgeschichte des Klerus im 5./6. Jh.n.Chr.," in J.-U. Krause and C. Witschel (eds.), *Die Stadt in der Spätantike—Niedergang oder Wandel* (Stuttgart, 2006), 413–439. But even though the clerical ranks theoretically were open to all (free) social classes, it nevertheless still was the case that candidates with independent wealth and the proper social connections generally had better prospects for rapid advancement in the ecclesiastical *cursus honorum* than colleagues of an inferior socio-economic pedigree (see Rapp, 200–202). In any event, Jer. is not quibbling with the idea of a peasant entering the priesthood. His concern is not the social class of the clergyman but instead his motivations for seeking church office to begin with or his abuse, for personal financial gain,



of his newfound status within the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Hence his pithy antithesis *ex inope divitem* specifically refers to a formerly impecunious clergyman with an obscure background who uses his ecclesiastical position as a vehicle for dishonestly amassing wealth. Two contemporary examples of this phenomenon may be cited. The first is taken from Jer.'s own correspondence. The man in question was a certain 'Onasus of Segesta', a priest in Rome toward whom Jer. felt such great personal animosity that he devoted an entire letter (*epist.* 40) to exposing his avarice (cf. *epist.* 40.2.2 *volo in nummarios invehi sacerdotes: tu qui dives es quid irasceres?*). Onasus undoubtedly was not his real name (pace G. Nenci, "Onasus Segestanus in Girolamo, *Ep.* 40," *RFIC* 123 [1995]: 90–94) but rather a satiric handle evoking the 'homo nobilissimus' Onasus of Segesta mentioned in Cicero's Verine orations (5.45.120); see J.-G. Préaux, "Procédés d'invention d'un sobriquet par saint Jérôme," *Latomus* 17 (1958): 659–664. Hence the nickname is an ironic allusion to the privileged position enjoyed by the Roman priest. An even more lucid contemporary example of the rags-to-riches clergyman is found in Augustine's correspondence. Antoninus grew up in Augustine's monastery at Hippo. Although the son of indigent parents, he was consecrated bishop of Fussala, an agrarian community some forty miles from Hippo, at the unusually young age of twenty (cf. Gaudemet, 124–127), and soon into his episcopate he became rich by defrauding his flock of money, crops, livestock, and other commodities (Aug. *epist.* 209.9, 20\*.4–7); cf. J. Merdinger, *Rome and the African Church in the Time of Augustine* (New Haven, 1997), 154–182.

*ex ignobili gloriosum* Jer.'s archetypal sham clergyman uses his ecclesiastical office not only to catapult himself from poverty to prosperity (*ex inope divitem*) but also to attain great social distinction (*gloriosum*) despite his undistinguished birth and upbringing (*ex ignobili*). Cf. *sacerd.* 3.11, where Chrysostom styles clerical social climbers οἱ διὰ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ σὸν [i.e. the Lord] ἐξ εὐτελῶν καὶ ἀτίμων ἔντιμοι καὶ περίβλεπτοι γεγονότες.

*quasi quandam pestem fuge* Jer. was partial to this formulation; cf. *epist.* 22.29.4 *quasi quasdam pestes abice*, 130.19.1 *quasi quasdam pestes ... virgo delevit*; see also *epist.* 58.6.1 *convivia veluti quasdam catenas fugias voluptatum*. This expression was later imitated by Ps.-Paulinus of Nola at *epist. app.* 2.17 *adulatorum quoque assentationes et noxia blandimenta fallaciae velut quasdam pestes animae fuge*. Cf. Ignatius' warning about deceitful clergymen: εἰώθασιν γάρ τινες δόλῳ πονηρῶ τὸ ὄνομα περιφέρειν, ἄλλα τινὰ πράσσοντες ἀνάξια θεοῦ. οὓς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ὡς θηρία ἐκκλίνειν. εἰσὶν γὰρ κύνες λυσσῶντες,

λαθροδῆκται· οὕς δεῖ ὑμᾶς φυλάσσεσθαι ὄντας δυσθεραπεύτους (*epist. ad Eph.* 7.1).

*corrumpunt mores bonos confabulationes pessimae* A translation of the iambic trimeter φθείρουσιν ἥθη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίας κακαί, which is quoted by Paul at 1 Cor. 15:33 (φθείρουσιν ἥθη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίας κακαί; Paul fumbles the meter with *χρηστὰ*). Scholars now agree that this line, which was proverbial in antiquity, appeared in Menander's *Thais*, but there is doubt about whether it originated in this now-fragmentary play; e.g. P. Ling, "A Quotation from Euripides," *CQ* 19 (1925): 22–27, traces it back to Aeschylus via Euripides. Regarding its context within the *Thais*, T.B.L. Webster, *Studies in Menander* (Manchester, 1960), 148, suggests that ὁμιλίας κακαί refers to the courtesan Thais and ἥθη χρηστὰ to a young lover corrupted by association with her. Jer. quotes this apophthegm on nine other occasions; five of the times he reproduces it in the present form and the other four he varies his wording slightly (i.e. *colloquia prava, colloquia mala* [= Vulg. 1 Cor. 15:33], *confabulationes malae*). On Menander's sententiousness, see S. Schirru, "Proverbie e sentenze nelle commedie di Menandro," in E. Lelli (ed.), *ΠΑΡΟΙΜΙΑΚΩΣ: Il proverbio in Grecia e a Roma* (Rome, 2010), 215–227.

#### 5.4

*tu aurum contemnis, alius diligit; tu calcas opes, ille sectatur* Jer. draws a sharp contrast between Nepotian (and, by implication, other monastic clergymen) and the avaricious clergyman through antithesis (*contemnis ... diligit* and *calcas ... sectatur*) and parallel structure (*tu ... tu; alius ... ille; aurum ... opes*). A few years later he echoed this passage when commemorating Nepotian after he had died and projected onto the young priest the ideal encapsulated here: *Nepotianus noster aurum calcans scedulas consecratur* (*epist.* 60.11.3). *aurum contemnis* and *calcas opes* are resolved into *aurum calcans*, while *sectatur*, which describes the sham clergyman's zeal for riches, is transmuted into *consecratur*, which conveys Nepotian's passion for *scedulas*, i.e. "the Scriptures ... and other written works, of which *epist.* 52 is representative" (Scourfield, 167).

Nepotian is praised not for despising gold as a metallic substance *per se*—here *aurum*, running parallel to *opes*, is a symbol of opulence (cf. D. Janes, *God and Gold in Late Antiquity* [Cambridge, 1998], 18–19), and so Nepotian is being lauded for having no regard for riches in general. Cf. Ambr. *off.* 2.66 *quid enim praecelsius eo viro qui auro moveri nesciat, contemptum habeat pecuniarum?*

*tibi cordi est silentium, mansuetudo, secretum; illi verbositas, adtrita frons, fora placent et plateae ac medicorum tabernae* These two sentences are structurally symmetrical in that each virtue in the first list occupies the same position as its corresponding vice in the second list: *silentium* → *verbositas*; *mansuetudo* → *adtrita frons*; *secretum* → *fora ... et plateae ac medicorum tabernae*. Cf. the much lengthier antithesis between secular and monastic *mores* set up by Chrysostom at *hom. in Act.* 16.4 (PG 60:132–134).

*silentium* Jer. regarded talking seldomly and only when necessary as an essential trait of the monk; see e.g. *epist.* 24.5.2, 50.4.1, 58.4.2; cf. Antin, 297–304. Silence was a much praised virtue in early Christian monastic culture; see e.g. Bas. *epist.* 2.2, 42.2, *reg. brev. tract.* (PG 31:1304); Greg. Naz. *orat.* 32.14; Anon. *hist. mon.* 6.1, 20.7; *apoph. patr.* Andrew 1 (PG 65:136), Arsenius 2 (PG 65:88); cf. P. Burton, *Language in the Confessions of Augustine* (Oxford, 2007), 6–7; H.G. Ingenkamp, “Geschwätzigkeit,” *RLAC* 10 (1978): 829–837. Other patristic theorists of the clerical life besides Jer. taught that priests should exercise extreme discretion in whatever they say; see Ambr. *off.* 1.8, 18, 31, 35, 68; Greg. Magn. *reg. past.* 2.4; cf. John Cass. *coll.* 4.20.

*mansuetudo* Gentleness is one of the attributes of the servant of the Lord in 2Tim. 2:24, and Ambrose encourages his priests to exhibit it in their dealings with their flocks (*off.* 1.89). For Chrysostom it is the mother of the virtues (*hom. in Mt.* 38.2 [PG 57:431]). Jer. links it with *silentium* as a core monastic virtue also at *epist.* 125.15.2.

*secretum* For Jer., prayerful isolation is a necessary ingredient of the monastic life (see e.g. *epist.* 14.6.1–2, 24.4.3, 58.5.1–2; cf. Antin, 291–304). The yearning for solitude is a trait conventionally attributed to hagiographic heroes and heroines (see e.g. Jer. v. *Hilar.* 20.3, *epist.* 108.6.2; John Cass. *coll.* 3.1; Geront. v. *Mel.* 5). On seclusion as a necessary precondition for the monastic life, see further *apoph. patr.* Theodorus 5 (PG 65:188); Bas. *epist.* 42.3; Greg. Naz. *orat.* 36.3; Jer. c. *Vig.* 16; Pall. *dial.* 19; Vinc. Lér. *common.* 1.2. In his letter to Heliodorus, which serves as the literary counterpoint to the letter to Nepotian (cf. 1.1–2), Jer. disqualified clergymen from being monks on the ground that their sacramental ministry does not afford them the luxury of solitude, which is necessary to attain spiritual perfection; only monks are able to be truly alone (*epist.* 14.6.1–2, 8.1). Writing now to Nepotian, he strikes a compromise and makes the cultivation of solitude—i.e. the allocation of time for quiet reflection alone, intermittent between liturgical and

pastoral duties—one of the defining behaviors of the monastic priest. Yet he only presents it, ever so briefly, in the form of a superficial ascetic platitude and never actually spells out, in practical terms, how Nepotian is to negotiate the delicate balance between the ideal of monastic solitude and the reality of an inherently public ministry. By contrast, Bede, in his portrayals of Cuthbert and other monk-bishops in his prose *Vita* of Cuthbert and *Historia ecclesiastica*, presents a well-articulated vision of the ideal bishop as both a dedicated contemplative monk and a public figure who conscientiously ministers to lay Christians in need of his services; see S.J. Coates, “The Bishop as Pastor and Solitary: Bede and the Spiritual Authority of the Monk-Bishop,” *JEH* 47 (1996): 601–619. That there was widely perceived to be an inevitable tension between solitude and the public dimensions of the sacramental ministry is illustrated by an anecdote told about Abba Apphy which is preserved in the *Apophthegmata patrum* (PG 65:133). Prior to becoming bishop of Oxyrhynchus he had been a dedicated monk, and he wished to carry over this same austerity into his life as a churchman, yet he could not muster the fortitude to resume his former discipline. He prayed earnestly to God, who replied that when Apphy had been a monk, he had God as his helper, but now that he is in the ‘world’, his fellow man performs this adjutory function.

*verbositas* At 8.1 Jer. condemns garrulousness in the pulpit. Verbosity in the monk is denounced at e.g. Jer. *adv. Iov.* 1.28, *epist.* 69.9.2; Aug. *bon. coniug.* 23.30; Ps.-Aug. *sobr. et cast.* 2; John Cass. *inst.* 4.39; Caes. Arel. *serm.* 155.3, 156.4; cf. Greg. Naz. *orat.* 32.32.

*adtrita frons* This phrase denotes shamelessness (cf. *TLL* II 1127.57 ff. sv *attero* and VI 1 vi.1358.22 ff. sv *frons*), and Jer. uses it in this sense further down at 8.1 and also at *comm. in Hiez.* 1.3 l. 915, 7.23 l. 1197, *comm. in Zach.* lib. 3, prol. l. 24, *epist.* 22.29.4. A.S. Pease, “The Attitude of Jerome towards Pagan Literature,” *TAPhA* 50 (1919): 150–167 (166n117), tentatively suggested that Jer.’s phrase evokes Juv. *sat.* 13.242 (*ieiectum semel adtrita de fronte ruborem*), and Wiesen, 75–76, later seconded this suggestion; cf. N. Adkin, “Juvenal and Jerome,” *CPh* 89 (1994): 69–72, who points out that Jer.’s *rubore frontis adtrito* in *epist.* 22.29.4 likely echoes the Juvenalian line in question. While it is possible that in the present case Jer. is evoking Juvenal, neither Pease nor Wiesen appears to have been aware that Martial also uses the phrase (*epigr.* 8.59.2 *lippa sub adtrita fronte lacuna patet*), and since Jer. does quote from the epigrammatist at least twice (see Hagendahl, 284), he conceivably could have taken it from Martial.

*fora placent et plateae ac medicorum tabernae* Public squares and downtown thoroughfares were proverbially bustling places in the urban landscape of Late Antiquity; cf. e.g. John Chrys. *hom. in Act.* 30.4 (PG 60:227) θεάτροις ἐπιτήδειος ὁ θόρυβος καὶ βαλανεῖοις καὶ πομπαῖς καὶ ἀγοραῖς. For this reason Jer. makes them the haunts of clerical men-about-town who do not share Nepotian's love for monastic peace and quiet (cf. *comm. in Dan.* 2.6.11 ll. 311–312, c. *Helv.* 21, *epist.* 50.1.2, 125.8.1, 125.9.2, 147.8.3); cf. John Chrys. *sacerd.* 3.13, on busybody widows who restlessly perambulate the marketplace. These noisy places and their attendant woes are studiously avoided by monks (John Chrys. *hom. in Mt.* 68.3 [PG 58:643]), and thus Jer. counsels Eustochium: *nolo te sponsum quaerere per plateas, nolo circumire angulos civitatis* (*epist.* 22.25.2). At *epist.* 50.5.1 and *comm. in Os.*, prol. ll. 149–150 Jer. mentions *medicorum tabernae* as being popular places to trade gossip; cf. Juv. *sat.* 9.102 (taverns and street corners); Clem. Alex. *paed.* 3.11.75.1 (taverns and barbershops). According to Horace (*sat.* 1.7.3), barbers and the *lippi*, those afflicted with the then-common eye malady of *lippitudo*, were notorious purveyors of gossip—the *lippi*, apparently because they were unable to work yet were not bedridden and so were able to roam about freely in Rome as busybodies; see A. Birley, “A Case of Eye Disease (*Lippitudo*) on the Roman Frontier in Britain,” *DocOph* 81 (1992): 111–119 (111).

*in tanta morum discordia quae potest esse concordia?* The *concordia-discordia* antithesis was traditional (see e.g. Tac. *Agr.* 15.2; Plin. *mai. nat. hist.* 24.1, 37.59).

*hospitiolum* The word *hospitiolum*, when used for a domicile, often refers to something along the lines of a peasant's shack (see *TLL* VI 1 xvii.3037.26 ff.). At *epist.* 42.3.1 Jer. employs the same word to describe his living quarters in Rome, and, there and as in the present passage, he does so to convey a sense of monastic modesty. He conceptualizes Nepotian's actual residence, which may not have been as cramped as the diminutive is meant to imply, as a tiny and unassuming living space befitting a monk (hence my translation “humble abode”), and as such Jer. may have intended his word-choice to serve as a rebuke of (non-monastic) clerical readers of *Epistula* 52 who dwelt in residences which did not conform to the ascetic ideal encapsulated by the diminutive. At *epist.* 60.10.7 he calls Nepotian's residence a *domus*, the more standard Latin word used in contemporary literature to describe the priest's domicile (see e.g. Ambr. *off.* 1.86; Poss. *v. Aug.* 26.1); also employed was the phrase *domus ecclesiae*; see K. Sessa, “*Domus ecclesiae*: Rethinking a Category of *Ante-pacem* Christian Space,” *JThS* n.s. 60 (2009): 90–108 (100).

As for the scale of Bishop Heliodorus' dwelling, we have possible analogues in other late antique episcopal residences roughly in the vicinity of Altinum; see Y. Marano, "*Domus in qua manebat episcopus*: Episcopal Residences in Northern Italy during Late Antiquity (4th to 6th Centuries AD)," in L. Lavan et al. (eds.), *Housing in Late Antiquity* (Leiden, 2007), 97–129.

*aut raro aut numquam mulierum pedes terant* Some monks made a point of refusing all female visitors (see Anon. *hist. mon.* 1.4, 6; John Cass. *inst.* 11.18; Pall. *hist. Laus.* 35.14), and Jer. comes close to recommending this same policy to Nepotian. With the forceful correlative *aut ... aut* he presents him with *only* two alternatives, and at any rate neither of these allows for frequent visitations from the opposite sex, especially because Jer. negativizes (*raro ... numquam*) the verb *terant*, which itself implies constant activity (*terere* = to wear out due to constant friction; cf. *OLD* sv *tero* 5b).

*omnes puellas et virgines Christi aut aequaliter ignora aut aequaliter dilige* These *puellae* are young married or unmarried women (cf. *OLD* sv *puella* 2a), as distinct from the *virgines Christi*, who either already have been, or intend to be, formally consecrated as virgins; on this ceremony in the fourth century, see R. D' Izarny, "Mariage et consécration virginal au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *La vie Spirituelle* 6 (1953): 92–107; R. Metz, *La consécration des vierges dans l'église romaine* (Paris, 1954). Jer.'s pithy injunction here to not show favoritism, made emphatic by anaphora (*aut aequaliter ... aut aequaliter*) and antithesis (*ignora ... dilige*), is motivated of course by the practical concern that Nepotian avoid even the semblance of an improper relationship with the opposite sex. According to Jer., who is evoking a Pauline injunction (1 Tim. 5:2), Nepotian exemplified this precept, for he treated widows with the respect due to mothers and behaved chastely around virgins as if they were his sisters (*epist.* 60.10.7).

*ne sub eodem tecto manseris; ne in praeterita castitate confidas* Jer. continues his list of regulations about the clergymen's conduct around women with this elegant bicolon crescens which is marked by anaphora, alliteration, asyndeton, parison, and homoioteleuton, all of which figures combine to enhance considerably the rhetorical impact of this pair of injunctions.

*ne sub eodem tecto manseris* Many years later Jer. used the same expression (*sub eodem conmanere tecto*) in relation to womanizing clerics (*epist.* 125.6.3). In both places he alludes to the practice, widespread during the

early Christian centuries, of priests cohabiting with women, usually widows or virgins (*virgines subintroductae*), for ostensibly religious reasons. The institutional church frowned upon these domestic partnerships because they could be, and undoubtedly sometimes were, used as a pretext for illicit sexual activity: in the fourth century alone six church councils formally condemned them; see P. de Labriolle, "Le 'mariage spirituel' dans l'antiquité chrétienne," *RH* 137 (1921): 204–225 (222). Ecclesiastical writers also railed against the practice. John Chrysostom explored the topic in two treatises (see J. Dumortier, *Saint Jean Chrysostome, Les cohabitations suspectes. Comment observer la virginité* [Paris, 1955]); cf. E. Clark, "John Chrysostom and the *Subintroductae*," *ChH* 46 (1977): 171–185; B. Leyerle, *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom's Attack on Spiritual Marriage* (Berkeley, 2001). *Subintroductio* was condemned, on a smaller scale, by others including Cyprian (*epist.* 4.2), Ps.-Cyprian (*De singularitate clericorum*), Basil (*epist.* 55), and Ps.-Jerome (*De vita clericorum*; PL 30:288–292). Jer., in addition to dropping numerous disapproving remarks about the practice throughout his works, devoted an entire writing to the subject that he masked as a personal letter of remonstrance to an unnamed mother and daughter in Gaul (*epist.* 117); for a detailed analysis of this writing and of Jer.'s satiric treatment of *subintroductio*, see Cain 2009b.

Short-term cohabitation generally was prohibited on the same grounds as longer-term living arrangements. For instance, Augustine never allowed a woman to stay in his residence for any length of time—not even his widowed sister, whose female servants, he feared, might prove too much a temptation for his clerical housemates (*Poss. v. Aug.* 26.1–3). He accordingly was outraged when Abundantius, a priest in his diocese, caused a great scandal by staying the night, alone, at the home of a woman of ill repute (*Aug. epist.* 65.1). Sleeping in the same house as a woman was taboo also in Egyptian and Syrian monastic culture; cf. *apoph. patr.* Theodorus 17 (PG 65:192) εἶπε πάλιν· μὴ κοιμηθῆς εἰς τόπον ὅπου ἐστὶ γυνή; *Theod. hist. rel.* 8.13. *Subintroductio* continued to be a serious problem into the sixth century. The Council of Toledo (527 or 531), for instance, decreed (*can.* 3) that a celibate clergyman may live with a woman only if she is a blood relative, and he may employ a live-in housekeeper who is not related to him, but she must dwell in a separate abode; if caught violating this decree he is to be defrocked and excommunicated.

*ne in praeterita castitate confidas* According to Cassian, Abbot Daniel of Scete also warned against being over-confident in one's past victories against lust: *commonetur pariter nec super successibus praeteritae puritatis debere*

*confidere, quam se perspicit pusillum quid declinantem a domino perdidisse, nec posse huius purificationis donum nisi per solius dei gratiam possideri* (coll. 4.15). This sentiment is expressed by many other patristic authorities. For some salient examples, see further Bas. *epist.* 42.1 τοιοῦτος γὰρ ὑπάρχει ὁλος ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος, μὴ ἀρκούμενος τοῖς φθάσασιν, ἀλλὰ τρεφόμενος οὐ τοῖς φθάσασι μᾶλλον, ἀλλὰ τοῖς μέλλουσι. τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖ ἄνθρωπον ὁ χθιζὸς τῆς γαστρὸς κόρος, σήμερον τῆς ἐμφύτου πείνης τὴν οἰκείαν τῆς βρώσεως παραμυθίαν μὴ εὐρισκούσης; οὕτως οὖν οὐδὲ ψυχῆς κέρδος τοῦ χθεσινοῦ κατορθώματος, τῆς σημερινῆς ἀπολιμπανομένου δικαιοπραγίας; John Chrys. *hom. in Hebr.* 7.3 (PG 63:64); Greg. Naz. *orat.* 2.14 καὶ μηδὲν μέτρον εἶδέναι τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀναβάσεως, μηδὲ κέρδος μᾶλλον τὸ κρατηθὲν ἢ ζημίαν τὸ διαφεύγον· ἀλλ' ἐπίβασιν αἰεὶ ποιεῖσθαι τὸ ποσὶ τοῦ ἐξῆς; Evag. Pont. *oct. spir. mal.* (PG 79:1164) ὅταν ἀνέλθῃς εἰς τὸ τῶν ἀρετῶν ὕψος, τότε πολλή σοι χρεια τῆς ἀσφαλείας. ὁ γὰρ πεσὼν ἀπ' ἐδάφους, ταχέως ἐγείρεται, ὁ δὲ πεσὼν ἀφ' ὕψους, εἰς θάνατον κινδυνεύει; Anon. *hist. mon.* 1.22 εἰ δὲ καὶ πάσας κτήσησθε, ὅπερ σπάνιον, μὴδ' οὕτως ἑαυτοῖς καταπιστεύσητε· τινὲς γὰρ οὕτω θαρρήσαντες καὶ πρὸς αὐτῷ τῷ ὕψει τῶν ἀρετῶν γεγονότες τέλος ἀφ' ὕψους ἐκπεπτῶκασιν; Jul. Pom. *v. cont.* 1.9.2; Greg. Magn. *reg. past. lib.* 4 *quibusdam saepe magnitudo virtutis occasio perditionis fuit, ut cum de confidentia virium inordinate securi sunt, per negligentiam inopinate morerentur.* On the tendency to become self-assured in a time of triumph, cf. Cato apud Aul. Gell. *noct. Att.* 6.3.14 *scio solere plerisque hominibus rebus secundis atque prolixis atque prosperis animum excellere atque superbiam atque ferociam augescere atque crescere.*

*nec David sanctior nec Salomone potes esse sapientior* Jer.'s citation of David and Solomon as implied models for chaste conduct and discretion around women, which has perhaps been prompted most immediately by his references to them earlier in the letter (2.1–2, 3.1), is somewhat ironic in this particular context given the womanizing of both men (Jer. mentions the paradox of Solomon's wisdom and sexual escapades at *epist.* 22.12.2, 125.1.2, and Chrysostom, that of David's prudence and uxoriousness, at *hom. in Mt.* 60.1 [PG 58:585]). In other contexts, however, it was standard to invoke David as an unqualified paragon of holiness and Solomon, of wisdom; e.g. David is one of Ambrose's most cited biblical *exempla* of personal sanctity in the *De officiis* (e.g. 1.21, 114, 236–238; 2.32–36; 3.1; at 1.96 he calls him *moralis magister*; cf. Bas. *epist.* 2.3). On David as an exemplar of holiness in patristic literature, and especially in John Chrysostom, see further P.-W. Lai, *John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits* (diss.: Durham University, 2010), 93–125.



On the Latinized form of David's name, which is indeclinable in the present passage but should be an abl. (i.e. of comparison), see on 2.2 *Abraham multo David senior fuit*.

*memento semper quod paradisi colonum de possessione sua mulier eiecerit* In his usage of *eiecerit* Jer. is following Gen. 3:24 *eiecitque Adam*, where God is the subject of the verb, while *mulier* is the subject in the letter to Nepotian. Here the perfect subjunctive *eiecerit* has a causative sense, i.e. "caused to be expelled" (for other examples of the causative *icere*, see *TLL* V 2 ii.309.70 f., 82 ff., 310.60 f.); all the translators have failed to capture this nuance of *eiecerit*. Elsewhere Jer. attributes the Fall to Adam's gluttony (*adv. Iov.* 1.4 and *epist.* 22.10.2, with Adkin, 87–88), but here he suggests that Eve's seductive advances were the root cause. This would appear to follow from his belief, voiced in *Adversus Iovinianum* (1.16), which he composed around the same time as *Epistula* 52 (see Introduction, "To Altinum and Beyond"), that the issue of chastity was at stake in the Fall: Adam and Eve lived as virgins in paradise, but subsequent to their ejection they became a sexually active couple.

Jer. applies the epithet *paradisi colonus* to Adam also at *epist.* 10.1.1. He calls Bonosus, his boyhood friend (cf. S. Pellistrandi, "À propos d'une recherche prosopographique: Jérôme, Bonose et la vocation monastique," in Duval, 13–25) and a monastic hermit, *quasi quidam novus paradisi colonus* (*epist.* 3.4.2) and styles resurrected believers *coloni paradisi* (*comm. in Eccl.* 3.18–21 l. 349, c. *Ioh.* 29). It is possible that he borrowed this expression from Tertullian, who also applied it to Adam (cf. *pat.* 5 *innocens erat et deo de proximo amicus et paradisi colonus*), but this source-critical attribution must remain tentative, for the phrase is not exclusive to Tertullian and Jer.: it is attested in early Christian funerary epitaphs (e.g. *CIL* 13.2414.5–6 *conditor omnipotens paradysi quem esse colonum iusserat ...*).

## 5.5

*sanctus quilibet frater adsistat vel germana vel mater aut probatae quaelibet apud omnes fidei* Here *adsistere* has the medical connotation of attending to the sick (cf. *TLL* II iv.902.20 ff., which adduces the present passage). In patristic Latin *frater* has a degree of lexical flexibility in that it is able to refer generically to a fellow Christian (Pétre, 104–140), or, in its more technical sense, to a monk (Lorié, 34–43). Here it probably has the former connotation. The generalizing *quilibet* is not distributive: it modifies only *frater* and not *germana* and *mater*. In fact, there is good reason to suppose that there

is an implied *tua* modifying *germana* and *mater*, i.e. that Jer. is referring to Nepotian's own sister and mother. While *germana* was used by Christians in a metaphorical sense for fellow female believers (cf. *TLL* VI 2.1918.74–1919.17), and employed on occasion by Jer. in this way (e.g. *epist.* 22.26.1), its more common meaning is 'sister by blood relation' (see *OLD* sv *germana* a). What is more, whenever Jer. speaks of "brothers and sisters in Christ" in his works, he overwhelmingly juxtaposes *frater* and *soror*, not *frater* and *germana*, as he does here. There are two even more convincing arguments for *germana* and *mater* being Nepotian's blood sister and mother. The first involves the phrase *probatae quaelibet apud omnes fidei*: with its generalizing *quaelibet* which parallels *quilibet* at the beginning of the sentence, it encompasses all "sisters and mothers in Christ". If the terms *germana* and *mater* are taken as generic designations for Christian women who are around the same age as the young priest (*germana*) or are older than him (*mater*), then they would be redundant alongside *probatae quaelibet apud omnes fidei*. Secondly, in the very next sentence Jer. picks up on his proposal of suitable nursing aides: *quodsi huiusce modi non fuerint consanguinitatis castimoniaeque personae* ... Now, *castimoniae* clearly accounts for *sanctus quilibet frater* and *probatae quaelibet apud omnes fidei*, but if it is supposed to account for *germana* and *mater* as well, then *consanguinitatis* becomes altogether superfluous.

The present passage is a precious *testimonium* for Nepotian's otherwise sparse prosopography. His sister is in fact altogether lost to the historical record but for this passing notice (the same, incidentally, is true for Paula's brother, who is mentioned, though not by name, only twice: in Jer.'s *Epitaphium sanctae Paulae* [*epist.* 108], at 6.3 and 33.3). Nepotian's mother, by contrast, is mentioned, though not by name, here and two other times in Jer.'s correspondence (*epist.* 14.3.2, 60.9.1).

*probatae quaelibet apud omnes fidei* For the collocation *probatae fidei*, cf. *epist.* 54.11.2 *habes sanctum Exsuperium probatae aetatis et fidei*, 107.9.3 *praeponatur ei probae fidei et morum ac pudicitiae virgo veterana*.

*multas anus nutrit ecclesia quae et officium praebeant et beneficium accipiant ministrando ut infirmitas quoque tua fructum habeat elemosynae* According to standard classical usage, *quae ... praebeant ... accipiant* should be *quae ... praebent ... accipiunt*: Jer. is using the subjunctive mood in an irregular way here (cf. Goelzer, 359–360).

These "elderly women" (*anus*) are enrolled widows (cf. *epist.* 123.5.8 *anus viduae*) at least sixty years of age (see *comm. in Is.* 3.4 ll. 41–43; cf. 1 Tim. 5:9) who receive financial assistance from the church (cf. *adv. Iov.* 1.14). In Late

Antiquity they usually were homeowners who could not make ends meet due to little if any support from a dowry or inheritance, and their financial woes were compounded by the burden of taxation; see J.-U. Krause, *Witwen und Waisen im römischen Welt* (4 vols., Stuttgart, 1994–1995), 2:52–55, 97–98, 224–225. These widows performed an official ministry in caring for the sick; cf. G. Dunn, “Widows and other Women in the Pastoral Ministry of Cyprian of Carthage,” *Augustinianum* 45 (2005): 295–307; Gaudemet, 186–188; J.-U. Krause, “La prise en charge des veuves par l’église dans l’antiquité tardive,” in C. Lepelley (ed.), *La fin de la cité antique et le début de la cité médiévale* (Bari, 1996), 115–126 (121). Several ancient church orders establish visitation and nursing of the sick as one of the primary pastoral responsibilities of the minor order of widows: e.g. *Testamentum domini* 1.40 (J. Cooper and A. Maclean, *The Testament of our Lord* [Edinburgh, 1902], 107); *Didascalia apostolorum* (CSCO 407:150); *Canons of Hippolytus*, can. 9 (R.-G. Coquin, *Les Canons d’Hippolyte*, *Patrologia Orientalis*, vol. 31, fasc. 2 [Paris, 1966], 363).

Jer. implies by his wording (*quae et officium praebeant et beneficium accipiant ministrando*) a cause-and-effect relationship between the widows’ performance of a charitable act and their consequent remuneration for this act, as if this latter were a payment for services rendered. Other sources suggest that the opposite was true, i.e. that they offered their services in gratitude for the benefaction they had received from the church. For instance, Chrysostom (*hom. 21 in Act.* 4 [PG 60:169]) says that poor widows should pray for deceased Christian patrons as if offering these prayers in exchange for the alms they previously had received; on the prayers of the poor as a recompense for almsgiving, see B. Ramsey, “Almsgiving in the Latin Church: The Late Fourth and Early Fifth Centuries,” *TS* 43 (1982): 226–259 (247–249). Likewise, a decree issued by the Fourth Council of Carthage urges widows supported by church funds to earn their keep (so to speak) and demonstrate their appreciation by strengthening the church *et meritis et orationibus suis* (CCSL 149:353).

*scio quosdam convaluisse corpore et animo aegrotare coepisse. periculose tibi ministrat cuius vultum frequenter adtendis* With the first-person *scio* Jer. appeals to his own experience as a detached but perceptive observer of human foibles and thereby subtly affirms his authority as a spiritual preceptor (cf. e.g. *epist.* 79.8.2); a comparable dynamic is at work in Juvenal’s *Satires* (see W. Anderson, *Essays on Roman Satire* [Princeton, 1982], 305–311). *quosdam* is insinuating (cf. e.g. *praef. in transl. Ps. iuxta LXX* p. 768 Weber, *epist.* 22.28.4, 52.12.2, 125.6.2, 146.1.1) and refers disparagingly to celibate

Christian men (presumably Jer. means primarily priests and monks) who become sexually attracted to, and perhaps enter into romantic relationships with, the women who nurse them back to health—or so we must infer from the otherwise vague but nonetheless elegant antithetical chiasmus *convaluisse corpore et animo aegrotare coepisse* as well as from the fact that Jer. makes this statement in the context of setting down regulations for the clergyman's interactions with women.

## 5.6

*si ... aut vidua tibi visitatur aut virgo, numquam domum solus introeas* Am-  
 brose issued to his priests the same directive about avoiding potentially  
 compromising situations: *viduarum ac virginum domos nisi visitandi gratia,*  
*iuniores adire non est opus, et hoc cum senioribus, hoc est cum episcopo, vel*  
*si gravior est causa, cum presbyteris. quid necesse est ut demus saecularibus*  
*obtrectandi locum? quid opus est ut illae quoque visitationes crebrae accipi-*  
*ant auctoritatem?* (*off.* 1.87); cf. Ps.-Jer. *epist.* 42.2 *frequenter visita iunctus*  
*obsequio clericorum ne dum secretaliter ac solus ingrederis, macules testimo-*  
*nium tuum;* Isid. *eccl. off.* 2.2.3 *viduarum ac virginum visitationes frequen-*  
*tissimas fugiant, contubernia extraneorum feminarum nullatenus appetant.*  
 Numerous church councils issued decrees forbidding clergymen from mak-  
 ing unchaperoned visits to the homes of Christian virgins and widows (cf.  
 on 5.4 *ne sub eodem tecto manseris*): e.g. Council of Elvira (305/6), *can.* 27;  
 Council of Carthage (397), *can.* 17, 25; Council of Toledo (400), *can.* 9; Coun-  
 cil of Agde (506), *can.* 10–11. Those who become priests only in order to have  
 freer access to women are a favorite satiric target of Jer.'s (*epist.* 22.28.3–  
 4; cf. 22.16.3, 22.28.4–6, 50.3.2). Julian Pomerius (*v. cont.* 2.4.2) rails against  
 clerics who prefer to be excommunicated than be separated from women;  
 Ps.-Cyprian (*sing. cler.* 28) makes a similar complaint. For their own part  
 Christian women were expected to be conscientious about avoiding clan-  
 destine meetings with monks and clergymen (see e.g. Bas. *epist.* 173; Jer. *epist.*  
 54.13.2). Marcella is said never to have invited a clergyman or monk into her  
 home unless there were plenty of witnesses (Jer. *epist.* 127.3.4).

*officium clericatus* Jer. used the same phrase at 5.3. On the word *clericatus*,  
 see on 5.3 *ne ... militia*.

*talesque habeto socios quorum contubernio non infameris* On the impor-  
 tance of having morally upright friends, see e.g. Cic. *amic.* 76; Ambr. *off.* 1.85,  
 212; Jer. *epist.* 107.11.1, 125.9.1 *mihi placet, ut habeas sanctorum contubernium;*

Syn. Cyr. *epist.* 49 τί κτῆμα κάλλιον ἢ φίλος ἡθὺς ἀκαπήλευτον παρεχόμενος; Macarius the Great forbids the holy monk from sharing a cell with a monk who has a reputation for mischief (PG 65:273).

*si ... si ... si* This threefold asyndetic anaphora is intended to be not only emphatic but also suggestive: i.e. Jer. provides Nepotian with three different, viable clerical candidates from which to choose his house-call companion(s).

*lector* The synagogue practice of reading from Scripture during the liturgy (cf. Lk. 4:16–17; Acts 13:15) was taken over by the primitive church and became a focal point of early Christian worship (1 Tim. 4:13; Rev. 1:3; cf. Just. Mart. 1 *Apol.* 67.3–4; 2 *Clem.* 19.1; Tert. *praescr. haer.* 41). This ministry was performed by highly literate Christians, lectors, who were specially appointed by the bishop. During the first three or so centuries of the church, lectors read from all of Scripture, but by the late fourth century their role in the liturgy of the Word had become somewhat diminished, as only deacons, priests, and bishops were permitted to read from the Gospels; cf. A.G. Hamman, “La formation du clergé latin dans les quatre premiers siècles,” *StudPatr* 20 (1989): 238–249 (240–243). The lectorate was one of the minor orders in the ancient Latin church, and from at least the mid-third century on (cf. Cyp. *epist.* 38.2) it served as the stepping-stone to higher clerical office such as the diaconate and eventually even the episcopate. In 385 Pope Siricius issued a series of canons in a decretal addressed to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona in Spain, and in this letter he delivered the first known papal prescription for the ecclesiastical *cursus honorum*. According to his plan, those who from their youth aspire to church office must first serve as lectors when they are young teenagers. After this, until they reach the age of thirty, they are to serve as acolytes and subdeacons and thereafter, in due course, pass on to the diaconate, priesthood, and finally the episcopate (Sir. *epist.* 1.9.13 [PL 13:1142–1143]).

*acolythus* A Christian neologism derived from the early Christian Greek noun ἀκόλουθος (ἀκώλυτος in later Greek); cf. G. Giangrande, “On the Origin of the Spelling *acolytus*,” *JThS* 28 (1977): 112–113. Acolytes constituted one of the minor orders of the western ecclesiastical hierarchy as early as the mid-third century, when (i.e. 251) there were forty-two acolytes attested in Rome alone; see H. Leclercq, “Acolyte,” *DACL* 1/1 (1907): 348–356. Acolytes’ chief duties revolved around the Mass: delivering the sacramental bread to all the churches throughout a given city every Sunday (PL 20:556), assist-

ing the priest or bishop during the Eucharistic celebration, and carrying candles in liturgical processions (Isid. *etym.* 7.12.29). Their other responsibilities included serving as letter-carriers (Cyp. *epist.* 45.4.3, 59.1.1; Aug. *epist.* 191.1) and distributors of alms (Cyp. *epist.* 77.3.2). And, on the strength of the present *testimonium*, they (along with lectors and cantors) also accompanied their clerical superiors on house-calls to parishioners.

*psaltes* A liturgical loanword from Greek (ψάλτης) meaning ‘cantor’, the person who led the musical aspect of Christian worship services primarily in the way of singing the psalms. Contrary to popular belief, the office of cantor did not formally emerge until the latter half of the fourth century (prior to that, lectors, on whom see above, cantillated the psalms). H. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven, 1995), 228, explains that the relatively late establishment of this office “attests a heightening of the difference between the cantillation of readings [from Scripture] and the singing of psalms and recognizes the more properly musical skills required by psalmody, skills that did not necessarily belong to a competent reader”; see further E. Foley, “The Cantor in Historical Perspective,” *Worship* 56 (1982): 194–213.

*non ormentur vestibus sed moribus* This sententious adjuration, framed as a succinct negative-positive arsis-thesis with homoioteleutic antithesis (*vestibus ... moribus*), embodies a commonplace of patristic moral exhortation, i.e. that the soul needs to be beautified by virtues rather than the body by fancy attire and fastidious grooming. See e.g. Clem. Alex. *paed.* 3.1.1, 3.35.2; Cyp. *hab. virg.* 9; Greg. Nys. v. *Macr.* 29; Ambr. *virg.* 1.6.30, *virginit.* 12.71; John Chrys. *hom. in Mt.* 30.6, 51.5, 89.4 (PG 57:370; 58:516, 786); Paul. Nol. *carm.* 25.49–53; Aug. *epist.* 211.10 *non sit notabilis habitus vester nec affectetis vestibus placere sed moribus*, 262.9; Greg. Magn. *hom. in evang.* 2.38.16.

*nec calamistro crispent comas* This alliterative interdiction, like the immediately preceding precept concerning attire, is aimed primarily at the priest’s helpers, though of course it applies by implication to the priest himself. Men curling their hair with heated irons, a widespread practice in the Roman world, often was associated with effeminacy; see e.g. Cic. *Sest.* 18; Quint. *inst. orat.* 2.5.12; Ambr. *epist.* 4.15.6; cf. C. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality* (Oxford, 1999), 131. For Jer., being primped in this way is a telltale sign of clerical charlatans (*epist.* 22.28.3, with Adkin, 261), mischievous stewards (*epist.* 54.13.2, 79.9.1), and young dandies on the prowl for pretty young virgins (*epist.* 130.19.1), and moreover artificially frizzy hair is a symptom

of an unhealthy preoccupation with secular fashion. Jovinian's followers accordingly are satirized as being coiffed: *quoscumque formosos, quoscumque calamistratos, quos crine composito, quos rubentibus buccis videro, de tuo armento sunt* (*adv. Iov.* 2.36; cf. *ibid.* 2.21). Ps.-Basil (*contub.* 6) and Ambrose (*epist.* 4.15.6) also condemn hair-curling in men.

*sed pudicitiam habitu polliceantur* Jer. was partial to this phraseology. Cf. *epist.* 50.3.1 *quaeso ... ut moneas eum, ne loquatur contra propositum suum, ne castitatem habitu pollicens verbis destruat*, 123.4.2 *in quo brevi accinctoque praecepto multa simul monita continentur: ne propositum viduae exquisitior cultus infamet, ne oculorum nutibus et hilaritate vultus iuvenum post se greges trahat, ne aliud verbo, aliud habitu polliceatur*. In all three passages *habitus* does not mean “monastic clothing” (as in its English cognate “habit”), as it does at e.g. *epist.* 108.20.3, where it refers to the uniform worn by Paula's nuns in Bethlehem. Rather, it means the ascetic's deportment or demeanor (cf. *OLD* sv *habitus* 2a; *TLL* VI 3 xiii.2484.51 ff.).

*solus cum sola secreto et absque arbitre non sedeas* Hieronymian source-critics have failed to recognize that this sequence bears a striking resemblance to a line from Terence's *Eunuchus*. In one scene Chaerea relates to his friend Antipho how he traded clothes with a eunuch named Dorus so that under this disguise he could gain unlimited access to, with an eye to sexually assaulting, his love-interest Pamphila, who had been staying at the time in the home of the courtesan Thais. His ruse was successful and, much to his delight, he was put in charge of guarding the girl. He was given explicit instructions by Thais neither to allow any man to see her nor to leave her side: *edicit ne vir quisquam ad eam adeat et mihi ne abscedam imperat; / in interiore parti ut maneam solus cum sola. adnuo / terram intuens modeste* (578–580). There are compelling reasons for believing that Jer.'s *solus cum sola secreto et absque arbitre non sedeas* constitutes an allusion to Chaerea's *ut maneam solus cum sola*. The arresting polyptotic expression *solus cum sola* is attested only here in Latin literature prior to Jer. This fact alone is noteworthy in view of Jer.'s exceptional fondness for Terentian turns of phrase more generally and for *Eunuchus* in particular, from which he quotes more than from any other play (for this reason N. Adkin, “Hieronymus Eunuchinus,” *GIF* 58 [2006]: 327–334 [327], styles Jer. a “*Eunuch-freak*”; cf. Id., “Terence's *Eunuchus* and Jerome,” *RhM* 137 [1994]: 187–195). But this rarity of occurrence assumes special significance when we consider that both authors deploy the locution in similar contexts where the propriety of male-female relations is at stake.

Jer. has not merely borrowed a flashy formulation; he has introduced it as an intertext which he summarily subverts. In essence, Chaerea is allusively held up as an example of someone whom Nepotian must *not* emulate in his own dealings with women. Chaerea had resorted to deception and feigned modesty so that he could be all alone with Pamphila and execute his scheme. Nepotian, by contrast, is urged to be duly circumspect during house-calls to Christian women and to avoid unsupervised socializing with them so that he does not expose himself to sexual temptation or give external observers grounds for harboring suspicions about him (cf. Cain 2009b). Jer.'s allusion thus implies a twofold antithesis between the cunning and prurience of Chaerea, and the integrity and sexual purity which he adjures his protégé to embody. This is an appropriate, even ideal, intertext for another, related reason: *Eunuchus* derives its title from Chaerea's duplicitous impersonation of a eunuch, and Jer. (and other contemporary ecclesiastical writers) regarded monks as metaphorical eunuchs; see M. Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity* (Chicago, 2001), 245–282. Throughout his correspondence and other writings he excoriates hypocrites who use their monastic vocations as a pretense for licentious living (see Wiesen, *passim*). In the letter to Nepotian he implicitly acknowledges the possibility that monastic clergymen may not always behave as 'eunuchs' or be blameless in female company but rather may follow Chaerea's lead and engage in sexual escapades under the guise of their religious profession, and he accordingly establishes measures to preclude this eventuality.

The scene in *Eunuchus* in which Chaerea recounts his exploits was well known in Late Antiquity and drew criticism from Christian moralists like Augustine (see e.g. *conf.* 1.16.26, *civ. dei* 2.7). Jer. retains a striking enough component of his infamous source-text for Nepotian and other contemporary readers who had been classically trained (i.e. those who had intensively studied Terence's plays as schoolboys under a *grammaticus*) to be able to recognize and relish his intertextual play. He nevertheless retouches his model in such a way stylistically as to reinforce the rhetorical import of his argument; on his custom of refining his literary models, see Cain 2009d and 2010b. He preserves the Terentian *solus cum sola* in its original form not only because it cues his readership to think of the rape scene more readily but also because the adjectival polyptoton itself (not to mention the close proximity of its two constituent words) has an intrinsic charm and vivaciousness. Jer. does however improve upon his model in other respects. He converts *manere* to the synonymous verb *sedere* (for their interchangeable use, cf. *TLL* VIII 2.281.11 ff.), thereby creating a stunning tonal effect through



fourfold sibilant initial-sequent alliteration (*solus, sola, secreto, sedeas*). Additionally, the hyperbatic displacement of *solus* from *sedeas* as well as the pleonastic *secreto et absque arbitre* (cf. *secrete et absque arbitris* at *epist.* 130.5.1) which combines assonance (*absque arbitre*) and alliteration (initial-sequent: *absque arbitre*; initial-interior: *secreto et*) and therefore complements the musicality of the immediately preceding polyptoton, work in synergy to lend exceptional vividness and emphasis to Jer.'s inculcation of Nepotian's need for absolute discretion around the opposite sex.

This was not the last time in his long and distinguished literary career that Jer. would invoke this cogent intertext in a discussion of monastic ethics. Almost twenty years after writing to Nepotian, he addressed a letter (*epist.* 128) to his Roman friend Gaudentius, a senatorial Christian with monastic leanings who had requested advice about how to give his infant daughter Pacatula, whom he had dedicated as a virgin at her birth, a proper ascetic upbringing amidst the self-indulgence of Roman aristocratic culture. At one point in the letter Jer. directs a polemical aside, in the generalizing second person singular typical of the *Diatribenstil* in satiric writing (cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, 419; E.G. Schmidt, "Diatriben und Satire," *WissZ Rostock* 15 [1966]: 507–515), at randy ascetic men who profess celibacy and yet plead any excuse they can to arrange clandestine meetings with their beautiful young maidservants, and asks, among other questions: *ceterum totos dies in huiusce modi confabulatione consumens quare solus cum sola et non cum arbitris sedes? cum etiam ipse non pecces, aliis peccare videaris* (*epist.* 128.3.5). Jer. has resolved his impressive sequence *solus cum sola secreto et absque arbitre non sedeas* from the letter to Nepotian into a slightly simpler form. He dispenses with the pleonastic *secreto*, though by the same token *solus cum sola + non cum arbitris* is pleonastic, and so the basic rhetorical impact in this regard has been minimally affected; but the elimination of *secreto* does nevertheless weaken the acoustical effect produced by the sibilant alliteration. The substitution of *non cum* for *absque* seems a negligible matter of lexical *variatio*, but there are minor rhetorical implications for this alteration: what is lost from the alliteration of *absque arbitris* essentially is gained back by the repetition of *cum*, which, on account of its identical placement within the two phrases, imposes a sense of symmetry on this last part of the sentence.

This second allusion to *Eunuchus* is not merely a function of Jer.'s propensity to recycle sententious phraseology that he has adapted from other authors. As in the letter to Nepotian, so here, the intertext serves to accentuate the polar opposition between two extremes of monastic behavior and at the same time to underscore the importance of maintaining absolute pro-

priety in one's interactions with women, especially behind closed doors. Additionally, in both letters Jer. makes an ironic connection between the title of the play and the notion of the monk as a spiritual eunuch (e.g. at the beginning of the above-cited passage he calls the monk a *virgo*). Yet there is a fundamental difference between the manner in which he applies the Terentian reminiscence in each letter. When writing to Nepotian he only alludes to the possibility of malfeasance on the part of the monk, but in the letter to Gaudentius he caricatures a certain monastic type who bears an uncanny resemblance to Chaerea in his obsession with arranging secret meetings with his attractive young slavegirls. And like Chaerea, who treated the sexual assault so nonchalantly because he was under the impression that Pamphila was a slave (856–858), this salacious monk shows no remorse for his behavior; rather, he goes out of his way to justify it. Moreover, in certain respects the Terentian allusion better suits the context of *epist.* 128 than it does that of *epist.* 52.

Moreover, the two newly adduced echoes of *Eunuchus* 579 in the letters to Nepotian and Gaudentius not only augment the ever-growing list of classical allusions in Jer.'s correspondence but, inasmuch as both constitute allusive appropriations of a Terentian character as a negative moral *exemplum*, they also typify a prevailing trend in the early Christian *Rezeptionsgeschichte* of Terence (for more on this trend, see Cain 2013b).

*si familiaris est aliquid loquendum* Like Jer., the anonymous author of the *De singularitate clericorum* (17), who may have been the fourth-century Donatist bishop Macrobius (so A. von Harnack, *Der pseudocyprianische Traktat De singularitate clericorum* [Leipzig, 1903], 1–72; W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church* [Oxford, 1952], 186–187), addresses the problematic issue of clergymen frequenting the homes of single Christian ladies who want to engage their guests in conversation that is overly familiar in tone. The author advises his clerical readers that if they are confronted with such a situation, they should maintain a safe distance by being consummate professionals, assuming a formal and stern demeanor and making it clear that their house-calls are of a strictly spiritual nature.

*nutricem* One of the roles traditionally assigned in Greek and Latin literature to the aged slave or freedwoman *nutrix* is that of trusted confidante to the young maiden; see M. Rosaria, *The Nurse in Greek Life* (Boston, 1917), 11, 26; V. Rosivach, "Anus: Some Older Women in Latin Literature," *CW* 88 (1994): 107–117 (116). Elsewhere Jer. warns his addressees to rid themselves of the company of temulent and untrustworthy *nutrices* (*epist.* 54.5.1, 107.4.7).

*maiores domus virginem, viduam, maritatum* At *epist.* 107.9.2–3 Jer. tells Laeta not to allow Paula the Younger to single out any one of her (gossipy) maidservants as an exclusive confidante; the only one who should fill this role is a *probae fidei et morum ac pudicitiae virgo veterana*.

*inhumana* In this particular context this adjective does not mean ‘uncivilized’ or ‘heartless’ but rather ‘anti-social’ or ‘alienated from human society’; cf. *TLL* VII 1 xi.1607.73 ff., which cites this passage under the gloss-heading *insociabilis*.

## 5.7

*caveto omnes suspiciones et quidquid probabiliter fingi potest, ne fingatur, ante devita* Jer. arranges this exhortation symmetrically with ring composition (*caveto ... devita*); on his fondness for introducing proscriptions with *cave*, *devita*, and other synonymous imperatives, see J. Leclercq, “Jérôme docteur de l’ascèse d’après un centon monastique,” *RAM* 25 (1949): 140–145 (142). Jer. later presented Nepotian as having consummately embodied his counsel about confounding gossip-mongers through sterling conduct: *igitur clericatum non honorem intellegens sed onus primam curam habuit, ut humilitate superaret invidiam, deinde, ut nullam obsceni in se rumoris fabulam daret, ut, qui mordebantur ad aetatem eius, stupeant ad continentiam* (*epist.* 60.10.5). On the general advantageousness of a pre-emptive approach in the spiritual life, cf. Ps.-Cyp. *sing. cler.* 42 *salutare remedium est praevenire potius quam praeveniri et anticipare potius quam anticipari viris fortibus congruit*. Rather like Jer., Chrysostom advises monks and clergymen how to cope with slanderous accusations concerning their dealings with virgins: πάντα οὖν πράττωμεν, ὥστε μηδεμίαν γενέσθαι πρόφασιν σκανδάλου· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἂν ἀδίκως ἐγκαλῶσι πειθόμεν, καὶ διαλύωμεν τὰ ἐγκλήματα (*subintr.* 9). Julian Pomerius (*v. cont.* 2.24.2) censures priests who flagrantly associate with Christian virgins and widows without giving a thought to the scandalous perception of their behavior and concedes that even if they are not engaging in secret affairs with their housemates, they nevertheless *vitam suam maculis sinistrae opinionis infamant*. Ignatius says that churchmen should avoid, as if they were fire, all grounds for baseless rumors about them (*epist. ad Trall.* 2.3). At *Off.* 1.18 Ambrose proposes strategies for how priests should confront slanderous accusations made against them (cf. Bas. *epist.* 24).

In issuing his directive to Nepotian Jer., who was by nature a pessimist about people’s propensity to dwell on the negative about others (see e.g.

*epist.* 117.8.2 *facilius mala credunt homines*; cf. Greg. Naz. *orat.* 2.1; Jul. Pom. *v. cont.* 3.9.1), certainly knew whereof he spoke: in Rome, some ten years earlier, he had been hounded by allegations of sexual impropriety on account of his close association with upper-class Christian virgins and widows, especially Paula, and these allegations eventually culminated in his being tried and evidently convicted of clerical misconduct in the episcopal court at Rome (see Cain 2009a, 114–124, 130–134).

*munuscula* Jer. usually uses this diminutive for gifts exchanged between correspondents (*epist.* 44.1, 53.1.1, 72.1.1, 72.5.2), as a self-depreciating descriptor for his own literary works (*epist.* 10.3.3, *comm. in Zach.* lib. 1, prol. l. 20, *comm. in Eph.* lib. 2 p. 507), and once for a kind of bribe that *lascivi et comp-tuli iuvenes* pay to *nutrices* in the hope of gaining access to the maidens under their care (*epist.* 128.4.5). This the only time that he uses *munuscula* in an erotic context; for the amatory shade of meaning of its root *munus*, see N. Zagagi, “Amatory Gifts and Payments: A Note on *munus*, *donum*, *data* in Plautus,” *Glotta* 65 (1987): 129–132. The diminutive force of *munuscula* in this case trivializes the tokens themselves, and by extension the practice of gift-exchange between lovers, as being silly and absurd. Wiesen, 76, further notes that, ‘the repeated use of diminutives (*munuscula*, *orariola*, *fasciolas*, *litterulas*) is meant to give an impression of lisping effeminacy and thus to add vividness to the mocking description’. On lovers’ insatiety for gift-exchange, cf. John Chrys. *epist.* 22 (PG 52:624) τοιοῦτον γὰρ οἱ ἐρῶντες οὐκ ἴσασι κόρον, οὐ δέχονται πλησμονήν, ἀλλ’ ὅσα ἂν λάβωσι παρὰ τῶν ἐρωμένων, πλείονα ἐπιζητοῦσι. On gift-exchange among lovers in classical comedy, see D. Dutsch, *Feminine Discourse in Roman Comedy* (Oxford, 2008), 76–79.

*fasciolas fasciae* (or *fasciolae*) were long bands of cloth that women wore around their head, legs and ankles, and chest—in this last instance they served as brassieres to simply hold breasts in place (Jer. *epist.* 117.7.3), flatten oversized ones (cf. Ter. *Eun.* 313–317), or enhance small ones (Mart. *epigr.* 14.134).

*vestes ori adplicatas* The translators generally have misinterpreted this phrase to mean a toiletry item; cf. Cola, 1.452: “fazzoletti per il capo”; Fremantle, 92: “face-cloths”; Labourt, 2.180: “les foulards qu’on applique au visage”; Ruiz Bueno, 1.414: “telas que se aplican a la cara”. However, *vestes* here refers to articles of clothing. *ori adplicare* is Jer.’s euphemistic circumlocution for ‘to kiss’ (the notice on the present passage in *TLL* IV 297.71 fails to capture

this nuance). On the kissing of a lover's clothing, see Prop. *eleg.* 4.3.29–30; Ov. *her.* 19.31, *met.* 4.117.

*degustatos cibos* At *epist.* 117.6.2 Jer. mentions the custom of lovers tasting each others' food at banquets (cf. Ov. *am.* 1.4.33–34, *ars amat.* 1.577–578).

*blandasque et dulces litterulas* *litterulae* = *epistulae* (cf. *TLL* VII 1 x.1534.21 ff.), and the pleonastic collocation *blandas ... dulces* qualifies these as love-letters. At *epist.* 147.7.1 Jer. mentions the *amatoriae epistulae* (4.4) that Sabinian would secretly send his nun-lover and he deplores their contents thusly: *quae ibi turpitudines! quae blanditiae! quanta de conducto stupro exultatio!* (like Sabinian's love-letters, those mentioned in Roman erotic poetry often are written and sent in secret; see Pichon, 215). Augustine (*epist.* 211.11) bars cloistered nuns from ever exchanging love-letters with men.

*sanctus amor non habet* With this choriamb cretic clausula Jer. succinctly concludes his inventory of amatory gifts. Of the three Latin terms for love (*amor*, *dilectio*, *caritas*), *amor* has the broadest lexical reach in Christian literature and, depending upon the context, it can stand for erotic, religious, conjugal, or filial love; see A. von Harnack, *Der Eros in der alten christlichen Literatur* (Berlin, 1894); R.T. Otten, "Amor, caritas and dilectio: Some Observations on the Vocabulary of Love in the Exegetical Works of St. Ambrose," in L.J. Engels, H.W.F.M. Hoppenbrouwers, and A.J. Vermeulen (eds.), *Mélanges offerts à Christine Mohrmann* (Utrecht, 1963), 73–83; Pétré, 25–100. Here *amor*, because it is qualified by *sanctus*, has an unambiguously religious connotation, referring as it does to the "chaste love" that clergymen ought to have for Christian women. For the Hieronymian concept of *sanctus amor* not tolerating inappropriate behavior, cf. *c. Vig.* 16 *matres vocamus sorores et filias, et non erubescimus vitiis nostris nomina pietatis obtendere. quid facit monachus in cellulis feminarum? quid sibi volunt sola et privata colloquia et arbitros fugientes oculi? sanctus amor impatentiam non habet, epist.* 147.7.1. Cyprian says that the consecrated Christian virgin has no business hugging, kissing, or even flirting with men (*epist.* 4.3).

*mel meum, lumen meum meumque desiderium* It is possible that in composing this short litany of amatory pet-names Jer. was thinking, however subconsciously, of one or both of the following Plautine passages: *cor meum, spes mea, mel meum, suavitus, cibus, gaudium* (*Bacch.* 18); *mea voluptas,*

*mea delicia, mea vita, mea amoenitas, / meus ocellus, meum labellum, mea salus, meum savium, / meum mel, meum cor, mea colustra, meus molliculus caseus* (Poen. 365–367). For Jer.'s reading of Plautus, see below on *in comoediis*.

*mel meum* A standard term of endearment in Plautine comedy (*Bacch.* 1197 & fr. 13, *Curc.* 164, *Most.* 325, *Poen.* 367, *Stich.* 740, *Trin.* 244, *Truc.* 528). For the related amorous epithet *mellitus*, see S. Rocca, “*Mellitus* tra lingua familiare e lingua letteraria,” *Maia* 31 (1979): 37–43.

*lumen meum* An erotic pet-name at Ps.-Tibull. *carm.* 3.11–12; Ov. *her.* 17.85–86; Apul. *met.* 5.13; cf. Pichon, 192; G. Sanders, *Bijdrage tot de studie der Latijnse metrische grafscripten van het heidense Rome* (Brussels, 1960), 132–134. The amatory *lumen*, attested also in funerary epitaphs (*CIL* 4.1970), was synonymous with *lux*, itself a regular term of endearment in Roman love poetry (e.g. Prop. *eleg.* 2.14.29; Ov. *am.* 1.4.25, 2.17.23); see Mart. *epigr.* 1.68.5–6 *scriberet hesterna patri cum luce salutem / Naevia lux inquit Naevia lumen have*, with U. Carratello, “Un folle amore in Marziale (Mart. I 68),” in *Studi classici in onore di Quintino Cataudella* (Catania, 1972), 391–401 (391–392). *lumen meum* was used occasionally to express affection in non-amatory Christian contexts as well. Thus Jer. applies it to Evagrius at *epist.* 3.3.2, and Egeria, writing in the last quarter of the fourth century while on pilgrimage in Palestine, addressed her fellow nuns back home as *domnae, lumen meum* (*itin.* 23.10 *bis*). It is attested also in Christian funerary inscriptions during the fourth through sixth centuries; see G. Sanders, “Égérie, saint Jérôme et la Bible: en marge de l'*Itin.* Eg. 18,2, 39,5, et 2,2,” in *Corona gratiarum* (2 vols., Bruges, 1975), 1.181–199 (190n4).

*meumque desiderium* E.g. Cicero calls his wife Terentia *mea lux, meum desiderium* (*epist. ad fam.* 14.2.2); cf. Catull. 2.5; Petron. *sat.* 139.4; Front. *epist.* 4.7.2. *desiderium* is attested also as a Christian term of endearment (e.g. *CIL* 6.2120).

*ceteras ineptias amatorum* I.e. the sentimental courtesies exchanged between lovers, of which Jer. has just cited three specific examples (*mel meum, lumen meum meumque desiderium*). The noun *ineptia* and its adjectival form often describe the irrational and frivolous behavior associated with love-sickness; see e.g. Plaut. *Merc.* 24–28; Tibull. *carm.* 1.4.24; Catull. 8.1, 14.24–25; Ov. *ars am.* 1.306, *trist.* 2.223; cf. Pichon, 167.

*lepores et risu dignas* Cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 13–14 *inest lepos ludusque in hac comoedia: ridicula res est*, though Jer.'s *lepores et risu dignas* is derisive, while Plautus' *lepos ... ridicula res est* is light-hearted and whimsical.

*urbanitates* Cf. *adv. Iov.* 2.8 *comoediarum mimorumque urbanitatibus et strophis*. Cicero (*off.* 1.104) identified the refined type of jesting (*iocandi genus urbanum*) as being typical of Attic as well as of Plautine comedy.

*in comoediis* Jer. means primarily the comedies of Plautus and Terence—as literary artifacts, that is, not as theatrical productions, for by his time these ‘classics’ were no longer performed on stage (see Cain 2013b). He knew those of Terence best because they were staple texts on the late Roman scholastic syllabus, and he studied them under Aelius Donatus, himself a renowned commentator on Terence. Plautus' comedies were read, though not as widely as Terence's, in the fourth and fifth centuries (see Hagendahl, *passim*; Jürgens, 88–107). For Jer.'s firsthand familiarity with the dramatic corpora of both playwrights, see López Fonseca.

*erubescimus* For the Christian disapprobation of the amatory element in classical comedy, see e.g. Lact. *epit. div. inst.* 58.5; John Chrys. *hom. in Mt.* 6.7 (PG 57:71); Isid. *etym.* 18.46.1; cf. T.D. Barnes, “Christians and the Theater,” in W. Slater (ed.), *Roman Theater and Society* (Ann Arbor, 1996), 161–180; K. Sallmann, “Christen vor dem Theater,” in J. Blänsdorf (ed.), *Theater und Gesellschaft im Imperium Romanum* (Tübingen, 1990), 243–259; W. Weismann, *Kirche und Schauspiele: die Schauspiele im Urteil der lateinischen Kirchenväter unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Augustin* (Würzburg, 1972). Jer. accuses the licentious deacon Sabinian of relishing comedies and mime plays (*epist.* 147.3.1; cf. 21.13.9) and reproaches Rufinus for his writings being redolent of base comic plays with respect to both their diction and content (*epist. adv. Ruf.* 16).

*erubescimus* here takes the accusative (*ineptias ... delicias et lepores ... urbanitates*), but later in the letter to Nepotian it governs another case; for this disparity, see on 12.2 *non erubescimus istiusmodi ineptiis*.

*in saeculi hominibus* The epithet *saeculi homines* is used for non-Christians on nearly two dozen other occasions in Jer.'s writings. For *saeculum* as a pejorative designation for the ‘world’ among Latin church writers, see e.g. G. Lettieri, “A proposito del concetto di *saeculum* nel *De civitate Dei*,” *Augustinianum* 26 (1986): 481–498; Orbán, 165–203; L. Verheijen, “*Mundus et saeculum* dans les *Confessions* de saint Augustin,” *SMSR* 38 (1967): 665–682.

*in clericis et in clericis monachis* The first *clericis* is a substantive (see on 1.1 *clericus*), but the second one is strictly an adjective (cf. *TLL* III vi.1339.49ff.) modifying *monachis* (see on 1.1 *monachus*), hence “in clergymen and in monks who are clergymen” (“clerical monks” is somewhat awkward-sounding, and so in translating *clericis monachis* I have treated *clericis* as a noun in apposition to *monachis*). Thus, in the two sequent subordinate clauses, *sacerdotium proposito* corresponds to regular clergymen and *propositum sacerdotio* to monks who happen to be clergymen.

*quorum et sacerdotium proposito et propositum ornatur sacerdotio* Beginning in the fourth century the word *propositum* acquired a new sense: it could mean the resolve to live the monastic life or, in a more technical sense, the monastic life itself (Adkin, 33; Lorie, 98); cf. J. Campos, “El *propositum* monástico en la tradición patristica,” in *Miscellanea patristica* (Escorial, 1968), 117–132; A. Zumkeller, “*Propositum* in seinem spezifisch christlichen und theologischen Verständnis bei Augustinus,” in C. Mayer and K. Chelius (eds.), *Homo spiritalis: Festgabe für Luc Verheijen zu seinem 70. Geburtstag* (Würzburg, 1987), 295–310. Here this word means the ascetic way of life, hence Rupert of Deutz’ gloss of the present passage as *qui et monachicam vitam profiteamur et sacri altaris ministerio fungimur* (*inc. Tuit.* 13, in *Deutsches Archiv* 22 [1966]: 457). *sacerdotium* here is inclusive of both the presbyterate and episcopate (see on 7.3 *sacerdotes*). Jer. is very insistent that there be an intimate correlation between the presbyterial-episcopal office and the ascetic lifestyle, and he emphatically conveys his sense of urgency in polyptotic anadiplosis (*proposito et propositum*) and hyperbaton (*ornatur*), and with chiasmus (*sacerdotium proposito et propositum ... sacerdotio*) he symbolically encapsulates the harmony and concinnity resulting from the healthy synergy of *sacerdotium* and *propositum*.

In his panegyric on Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus expresses the same sentiment as Jer. but in a polemical context, when disdaining crooked clergymen whom he sets up as foils to the bishop of Alexandria: ὣν οὐχ ὁ τρόπος τὸν βαθμὸν, ὁ βαθμὸς δὲ τὸν τρόπον πιστεύεται, ‘Whose way of life is not a credit to their ecclesiastical rank, and whose ecclesiastical rank is not a credit to their way of life’ (*orat.* 21.9). Both Jer. and Gregory make their respective statements in the context of addressing clerical hypocrisy and also both beautify their language with the figures of chiasmus and polyptotic anadiplosis. These similarities in themselves are sufficient to warrant suspicion that Jer. has modelled his own sententious formulation on Nazianzen’s, and this suspicion seems especially justified when we consider that Jer. elsewhere appropriates phraseology from this very same section of Gregory’s



oration on Athanasius (see e.g. N. Adkin, “*Heri catechumenus, hodie pontifex* (Jerome, *Epist.* 69.9.4),” *AClass* 36 [1993]: 113–117).

For the notion of adorning one’s clerical office with a virtuous lifestyle, cf. Theodoret’s remark about the monastic bishop Aphthonius: οὕτω καὶ τὴν προεδρίαν κοσμήσας καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπαυξήσας (*hist. rel.* 5.8; cf. *ibid.* 17.1); see also Zen. *tract.* 1.1.4 *deum enim patrem vos et habere et possidere monstratis, cum pudicitiam, in qua deus habitat, non dicam diligitis, sed luculentis moribus adornatis.*

### 5.8

*nec hoc dico quod aut in te aut in sanctis viris ista formidem* Jer. inserts such a disclaimer into numerous of his letters of spiritual counsel. See *epist.* 54.13.5 *haec dico, non quo de te sinistrum quid metuam, sed quo pietatis affectu etiam, quae tuta sunt, pertimescam*, 79.7.4 *absit, ut sinistrum quippiam mihi de te suspicari liceat, sed ex abundanti lubricam aetatem monuisse pietatis est*, 117.2.1 *me non idcirco scribere, quia aliquid de vobis sinistrum suspicer*, 123.17.2 *sed absit, ut de te talia sentiam, ut sinistrum quippiam suspicer de ea, quae suam animam domino consecravit*, 130.19.1 *non quo haec in te timere debeam*. Cf. Ign. *epist. ad Trall.* 8.1 οὐκ ἐπεὶ ἔγνωι τοιοῦτόν τι ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ προφυλάσσω ὑμᾶς ὄντας μου ἀγαπητούς, προορώων τὰς ἐνέδρας τοῦ διαβόλου.

*sed quod in omni proposito, in omni gradu et sexu et boni et mali repperiantur* Asyndetic anaphora (*in omni ... in omni ...*) and antithesis (*boni ... mali*) lend vividness to the passage as a whole. In two other places Jer. speaks in a similar vein about the ethical disparity between virtuous and naughty clergymen: *comm. in Agg.* 1.11 ll. 448–450 *nec haec dicimus quo universos generaliter accusamus, sed quod in omni officio et gradu sint alii qui aedificent, et alii qui destruant templum dei*, *epist.* 125.17.2 *cum ad perfectam aetatem veneris ... et te vel populus vel pontifex civitatis in clerum adlegerit, agito, quae clerici sunt, et inter ipsos sectare meliores, quia in omni condicione et gradu optimis mixta sunt pessima.*

*malorumque condemnatio laus bonorum sit* Jer. has just employed chiasmus in order to add rhetorical spice to his prose (cf. 5.7 *et sacerdotium proposito et propositum ... sacerdotio*), and now he does so again with this apophthegmatic finished which is framed as a chiastic antithesis. Cf. Gregory of Nyssa’s reasoning for why Gregory Thaumaturgus chafed his schoolmates in Alexandria: χαλεπὸν ἦν τοῖς ὁμήλιξι θέαμα, νέος ὑπὲρ τὴν ἡλικίαν

τῇ σωφροσύνῃ κοσμούμενος. ὁ γὰρ τοῦ καθαρεύοντος ἔπαινος, τῶν μολυνομένων  
ὄνειδος ἦν (PG 46:901).

## Chapter 6

Jer. bemoans that pagan priests, actors, charioteers, and prostitutes have rights on succession, while this legal privilege is denied to monks and career churchmen. He offers a veiled criticism of Valentinian's law of 370 which outlawed clerical and monastic legacy-hunting, and he insists that the imperial government, even if Christian leaders are at its helm, should not try to regulate the financial affairs of the church or of its officers. From there he transposes into vivid satiric caricatures of two classes of clergymen who use their ecclesiastical office as a cover for accumulating wealth and social status: impoverished bumpkins-turned-gourmands and *captatores* who prey on rich, childless widows and widowers in the hope of securing legacies from them. With respect to their intrinsic literary merit (e.g. their sophisticated engagement with the conventions of pagan satire) these sketches are brilliant compositions, but nevertheless the point has not yet been made by scholars that they actually risk undermining Jer.'s argument against the restrictions imposed by Valentinian's law. For by way of highlighting the injustice of this measure he contrasts the leniency shown to certain groups of citizens (i.e. actors, charioteers, prostitutes) who were generally regarded as having a fundamental moral deficiency, with the severity shown toward upstanding churchmen. Yet, by the end of the chapter he has succeeded in demonstrating that clergymen can be just as (if not more!) morally depraved than these pagan *infames*; in other words, his brutal exposure of predatory clerics justifies the urgent need for precisely the kind of law that Valentinian issued.

## 6.1

*pudet dicere* This parenthetical exclamation opens a chapter also at *epist.* 22.14.1. Antin, 51, traces Jer.'s usage to Plautine influence (*Cas.* 897), but this seems too myopic, for this expression is relatively common in classical Latin literature (e.g. Cic. *Quinc.* 79); this is to say nothing of the fact that in Antin's proposed source-text it is not even parenthetical like it is in the present passage. Whatever the case, Jer. clearly is attempting to grab the reader's attention with the abrupt shift in subject matter that is signalled by this *exclamatio* (cf. 12.2 *pro pudor!*).

*sacerdotes idolorum et mimi et aurigae et scorta hereditates capiunt. solis clericis et monachis hoc lege prohibetur et prohibetur non a persecutoribus, sed a principibus Christianis* The reading of *H*, which I have adopted,

seems preferable to Hilberg's *sacerdotes idolorum, mimi*. The omission of the conjunction makes little sense here inasmuch as *et* links the second item in the list to the third and the third to the fourth; once the consistent polysyndeton is restored, the short sentence flows more smoothly.

In the present passage Jer. is referring to a law issued some twenty-five years earlier by the emperor Valentinian I (with Valens and Gratian) which criminalized the practice of *captatio* by Christian clerics and monks. *Captatio* had of course been a rampant problem in secular Roman society ever since the late Republic; on previous legal attempts to suppress it, see J. Tellegen, "*Captatio* und *crimen*," *RIDA* 26 (1979): 387–397, and for its survival into the fourth century, with specific reference to the Valentinianic law cited here by Jer., see I. Davidson, "*Captatio* in the Fourth-century West," *StudPatr* 34 (2001): 33–43. This law was addressed to Pope Damasus, who himself had a reputation for pandering to wealthy Christian widows and even was branded by contemporary critics with the pejorative nickname *matronarum auriscalpius* ("ear-tickler of matrons"); see J. Fontaine, "Un sobriquet perfide de Damase, *matronarum auriscalpius*," in D. Porte and J.-P. Néraudau (eds.), *Res sacrae* (Brussels, 1988), 177–192. The law was read on 30 July 370 in the churches of Rome, a city in which inheritance- and legacy-hunting had reached epidemic proportions by this period (cf. Amm. Marc. 14.6.22). It forbade clergymen, ex-clergymen, and monks from ingratiating themselves with rich widows and orphans so as to receive a testamentary bequest from them. Suspected offenders were to be reported to the civil authorities, and if convicted they were to be banished by the public courts and prohibited from obtaining anything from their victims either through an act of generosity (i.e. while the testator was still alive) or through a last will and testament. The law (*CTh* 16.2.20) reads in full: *ecclesiastici aut ex ecclesiasticis vel qui continentiam se volunt nomine nuncupari, viduarum ac pupillarum domos non adeant, sed publicis exterminentur iudiciis, si posthac eos adfines earum vel propinqui putaverint deferendos. censemus etiam, ut memorati nihil de eius mulieris, cui se privatim sub praetextu religionis adiunxerint, liberalitate quacumque vel extremo iudicio possint adipisci et omne in tantum inefficax sit, quod alicui horum ab his fuerit derelictum, ut nec per subiectam personam valeant aliquid vel donatione vel testamento percipere. quin etiam, si forte post admonitionem legis nostrae aliquid isdem eae feminae vel donatione vel extremo iudicio putaverint relinquendum, id fiscus usurpet. ceterum si earum quid voluntate percipiunt, ad quarum successionem vel bona iure civili vel edicti beneficiis adiuvantur, capiant ut propinqui* ("Ecclesiastics, ex-ecclesiastics, and those men who wish to be called by the name of Continents shall not visit the homes of widows and female wards, but they shall

not be banished by the public courts, if hereafter the kinsmen, by blood or marriage, of the aforesaid women should suppose that such men ought to be reported to the authorities. We decree, further, that the aforesaid clerics shall be able to obtain nothing whatever, through any act of liberality or by a last will of those women to whom they have attached themselves privately under the pretext of religion. Everything that may have been left by the aforesaid women to any one of the aforesaid ecclesiastics shall be ineffective to such an extent that they shall not be able, even through an interposed person, to obtain anything either by gift or by testament. Furthermore, if by chance after the admonition of Our law the aforesaid women should suppose that anything ought to be bestowed on the aforesaid men, either by gift or by last will, such property shall be appropriated by the fisc. If, on the other hand, the aforesaid women, to whose succession or property they are assisted either by the civil law or by benefit of the edict, they shall take it as near kinsmen"; C. Pharr, *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmundian Constitutions* [Princeton, 1952], 443–444). In 321 Constantine had officially recognized the church as a legitimate beneficiary of legacies (*CTh* 16.2.4; cf. J. Evans Grubbs, *Law and Family in Late Antiquity* [Oxford, 1995], 102–139), but this imperial provision apparently was so egregiously abused in subsequent decades that Valentinian felt the need to forcibly intervene to protect the financial interests of virgins and widows from the predation of unscrupulous clerics and monks; cf. P. Laurence, "Les femmes riches, les clercs et les moines: Code Théodosien et témoignages épistolaires," in P. Laurence and F. Guillaumont (eds.), *Epistulae antiquae, IV* (Louvain, 2006), 255–268.

Although he goes on to protest that he is not being critical of Valentinian's law and in fact qualifies his disapprobation in terms that remain ostensibly respectful of imperial authority (*nec de lege conqueror, sed doleo cur meruerimus hanc legem*), Jer. nevertheless subtly registers his disdain by means of the emphatic anadiplosis *prohibetur et prohibetur* which is followed by the antithetical negative-positive arsis-thesis *non a persecutoribus, sed a principibus Christianis*. Some ten years earlier Ambrose had expressed his disapproval of the same law; see *epist.* 73 [18].<sup>14</sup> *scribuntur testamenta templorum ministris, nullus excipitur profanus, nullus ultimae conditionis, nullus prodigus verecundiae; soli ex omnibus clerico commune ius clauditur a quo solo pro omnibus votum commune suscipitur, officium commune defertur, nulla legata vel gravium viduarum, nulla donatio. et ubi in moribus culpa non deprehenditur tamen officio multa praescribitur. quod sacerdotibus fani legaverit Christiana vidua valet, quod ministris dei non valet.* The bishop of Milan, like Jer., points out how ridiculous it is to deny holy clergymen inheritance rights

that are enjoyed by those who are anything but holy and who certainly do not contribute to the common good of the state. Jer. is more specific and isolates several groups of people: pagan priests (*sacerdotes idolorum*, a patently polemical epithet), actors (*mimi*), charioteers (*aurigae*), and whores (*scorta*; cf. on 3.8 *meretrix*). He could of course have chosen, as foils to his *clerici* and *monachi*, any of a number of groups of Romans who were granted at least some inheritance rights by law, but for maximal rhetorical effect he singles out those who he feels are especially offensive to Christian sensibilities. He aims to provoke his ascetically-minded readers to moral outrage over the law's hypocrisy by appealing to their opposition to traditional Roman religion (the *sacerdotes idolorum* head the list because they represent the quintessential *religious* antithesis to Christian priests and monks), the theater (see on 5.7 *erubescimus*), the circus, and the sex trade. For the late fourth-century ascetic moralist these last three demographic subsets would have seemed even more reprehensible still for another reason: not only prostitutes but also charioteers and especially actors/actresses were stereotyped as being promiscuous in their private lives; see H. Herter, "Die Soziologie der antiken Prostitution im Lichte des heidnischen und christlichen Schrifttums," *JbAC* 3 (1960): 70–111 (98–99); S. Leonstini, *Die Prostitution im frühen Byzanz* (Vienna, 1989), 28–29, 124–130. As for charioteers, some are known to have been professing Christians (cf. A. Ferrua, "Antichità cristiane: Liber l'auriga del circo," *CCatt* 98 [1947]: 438–447), but nevertheless their profession is roundly denounced by patristic authors (see e.g. T.M. Finn, *The Liturgy of Baptism in the Baptismal Instructions of St. John Chrysostom* [Washington, 1967], 99–102).

Notwithstanding the rhetorically charged nature of the passage, there is no reason to doubt the veracity of Jer.'s claims about the basic succession rights of these various groups. As for pagan priests, it is true that Gratian had cancelled certain privileges enjoyed by the Vestal Virgins and *ministri* (i.e. pagan religious functionaries who ranked lower than *sacerdotes*), such as their ability to inherit landed properties willed to them; see R. Lizzi Testa, "*Augures et pontifices*: Public Sacral Law in Late Antique Rome (Fourth-Fifth Centuries AD)," in Cain-Lenski, 251–278 (263–264), yet the inheritance rights of *sacerdotes* proper do not appear to have been restricted by imperial measures. Although actors, charioteers, and prostitutes were *infames*—i.e. citizens who had diminished legal rights because they were perceived to be morally blameworthy in some way or another (J. Gardner, *Being a Roman Citizen* [London, 1993], 110–153)—they nevertheless were entitled to inherit property, even if under certain circumstances their rights might have been limited. For the intricacies of Roman inheritance law more generally, see

P. Voci, *Diritto ereditario romano* (2 vols., Milan, 1960–1963), and on the succession rights of prostitutes more specifically, see T.A. McGinn, *The Economy of Prostitution in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor, 2004).

*tamen nec sic refrenatur avaritia* The insatiability of avarice is a commonplace in ancient literature both pagan and Christian. See e.g. Theogn. *eleg.* 227–232, 596; *Anth. Gr.* 10.76.3–4 ἡ δὲ περισσὴ / θυμὸν αἰεὶ κατέδει χρυσομανῆς μελέτη; Sen. *epist.* 94.43 *avarus animus nullo satiatur lucro*, *cons. ad Helv.* 10.11; Dio Chrys. *orat.* 17.7; Plut. 524a, 525b; *apoph. patr.* Isidorus 6 (PG 65:224) ὁ δεινὸς καὶ πάντολμος τῆς φιλοχρηματίας ἔρως, κόρον οὐκ εἰδῶς; Greg. Naz. *orat.* 7.20 τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ τοῦ πλουτεῖν νόσος, ὅρον τοῦ δεῖσθαι πλείονος οὐκ ἔχουσα, ἀλλὰ τὸ ποτὸν αἰεὶ δίψους ἔτι ποιουμένη φάρμακον; Ambr. *Nab.* 2.4 *quanto plus habueris, plus requiris et quidquid adquisieris, tamen tibi adhuc indiges*; Jer. *epist.* 100.15.2 *numquam divitiarum desiderium ullis divitiis satiari potest; eget semper, qui avarus est ... avaritia nec satiari potest, sed, quo plus habuerit, plus requirit*; John Chrys. *hom. in Ioh.* 52.4, 64.3, *hom. in Hebr.* 15.7, *hom. in Phil.* (PG 62:226) φιλαργυρία δεινὴ, τὸ πλεόν τῆς χρείας αἰτεῖν, *quod nemo laeditur nisi a se ipso* 6; Aug. *serm.* 107.10, 177.6; Nil. Anc. *orat. in Alban.* p. 709, *de monast. exercit.* 55 (PG 79:788); John Cass. *inst.* 7.24; Pet. Chrys. *serm.* 29.1; Salv. *ad eccl.* 1.1.1; Caes. Arel. *serm.* 41.1; Boeth. *cons. phil.* 3.3.

*nec de lege conqueror, sed doleo cur meruerimus hanc legem* Cf. Ambrose's advisedly circumspect remarks about Valentinian I's law in a letter addressed in the autumn of 384 to the boy-emperor Valentinian II: *at contra nobis etiam privatae successionis emolumenta recentibus legibus denegantur et nemo conqueritur; non enim putamus iniuriam quia dispendium non dolemus ... quod ego non ut querar sed ut sciant* [Ambrose's pagan opponents in the Altar of Victory affair are the subject of this verb] *quid non querar comprehendere; malo enim nos pecunia minores esse quam gratia* (*epist.* 73 [18].13–14).

*cauterium bonum est sed quo mihi vulnus ut indigeam cauterio?* Jer. elegantly encloses this rhetorical question by polyptotic kuklos (*cauterium ... cauterio*) (Hritz, 25, failed to adduce this particular instance of this potent figure). Cauterization was a common surgical procedure in the Greco-Roman world; see L.H. Toledo-Pereyra, "Galen's Contribution to Surgery," *JHM* 28 (1973): 357–375. It was invoked as a metaphor by Jer. (e.g. *epist.* 55.5.5, 117.2.1; cf. Pease, 76–77) and other Christian authors (e.g. Greg. Naz. *orat.* 2.18; Theod. *hist. rel.* 17.5; on amputation, cf. Ambr. *off.* 2.135) to pictorialize the process by which vice is removed from the soul. Like Jer. does in the present

passage, Clement of Alexandria (*strom.* 1.27.1–2) deploys the metaphor in a legal context, likening secular laws to cautery which have been put in place to eradicate the disease of crime from society.

## 6.2

*per fideicommissa legibus inludimus* Despite the restrictions that Valentinian's law attempted to place on the ability of churchmen and monks to inherit property, there is every indication that *captatio* continued more or less unchecked, and indeed it was still a problematic issue in the western church in the late fifth century. Writing in Gaul, Julian Pomerius (*v. cont.* 2.4.3) cast aspersions on priests who under the guise of being protectors for widows and orphans secretly conspire to procure an inheritance from them. The late fourth-century imperial legislation seems to have had a relatively limited impact for two reasons. First, legacy-hunting was difficult to prove in a court of law; see E. Champlin, *Final Judgments: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills, 200 B.C.-A.D. 250* (Berkeley, 1991), 96. More problematic, though, was the loophole, mentioned here by Jer., that allowed *captatores* to evade prosecution by setting up trusts (*fideicommissa*) whereby a testator could request his or her heir to hand over money or property to a third-party *captator*. On the technicalities involved in the arrangement of *fideicommissa*, see D. Johnston, *The Roman Law of Trusts* (Oxford, 1988), 76–107.

*quasi maiora sint imperatorum scita quam Christi, leges timemus, evangelia contemnimus* The same inconsistency in Christians reverencing imperial laws more than the Gospel precepts is addressed by Chrysostom at *hom. in Mt.* 19.9 (PG 57:285) and *hom. in Act.* 5.4 (PG 60:55–56).

*mater filiorum, id est gregis sui, ecclesia, quae illos genuit, nutrit et pavit* By the early third century *mater* (μήτηρ) had already gained evidently wide currency, in Africa and elsewhere, as an appellation for the church. For the concept and its origin, see K. Delahaye, *Ecclesia mater chez les Pères des trois premiers siècles* (Paris, 1964); J. Plumpe, *Mater ecclesia: An Inquiry into the Concept of the Church as Mother in Early Christianity* (Washington, 1943). The phrase 'mother church' occurs fifteen times in Cyprian, eight in Ambrose (see D. Casagrande, "La *ecclesia mater* negli scritti di S. Ambrogio," *EcclMat* 3 [1965]:182–184), fourteen in Jer. (see Adkin, 105–107), and seventy in Augustine (see R. Palmero Ramos, *Ecclesia mater en San Agustín* [Madrid, 1970]). In the present passage Jer. is very insistent with his metaphor, aggregating as he does three different homoioteleutic verbs associated with maternal



activities (*genuit, nutrit, pavit*). For the image of God's faithful as a 'flock' (*grex*) in biblical and patristic literature, see *TLL* VI 1 xii.2333.71ff.

*quid nos inserimus inter matrem et liberos?* After having just portrayed the church as the mother and the clergy as her children (for this same imagery, cf. Cypr. *epist.* 43.6), Jer. now concludes his muted criticism of imperial meddling in church affairs with this acerbic rhetorical question which grounds its emotional appeal in the ancient notion of the proverbially inseparable bond between a mother and her offspring. According to Seneca (*provid.* 2.5), mothers by nature are inclined to be more sentimental toward their children than fathers, and the anonymous author of *v. Theod. Syk.* 25 speaks of the deep affection for their children that consumes some mothers like fire (αἵτινες μητέρες περὶ τοὺς παῖδας ὡς πῦρ τῷ πτόῳ περικαίονται); cf. Themist. *orat.* 32.360d; Greg. Naz. *orat.* 14.11; Ambr. *Ios.* 2.5; John Chrys. *hom. 1 de paen.* (PG 49:278); see also D. O'Roark, "Parenthood in Late Antiquity: The Evidence of Chrysostom," *GRBS* 40 (1999): 53–81 (78–80).

*gloria episcopi est pauperum opibus providere* One of the bishop's primary administrative responsibilities as overseer of his church's budget was to provide for the poor and needy (see e.g. John Chrys. *sacerd.* 3.16; Jer. *comm. in Mich.* 2.9–10 ll. 318–319; Jul. Pom. *v. cont.* 1.25.1, 2.2.1; cf. Gaudemet, 306–311; Rapp, 223–234), usually through a clerical almoner appointed by himself (see 9.2 *scit ... praeficiat*, with n.).

*episcopi* ἐπίσκοπος, of which *episcopus* is the Latin transliteration, is first attested in a Christian sense in the NT as 'overseer' or head of a congregation (Acts 20:28; Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:2; Tit. 1:7; 1 Pet. 2:25; cf. *TDNT* 2.608–622). For its usage in the early Christian centuries, see Y. Meimaris, *Sacred Names, Saints, Martyrs and Church Officials in the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri pertaining to the Christian Church of Palestine* (Athens, 1986), 203–213; Mohrmann, 4.231–252; H. Solin, "Episcopus und Verwandtes: Lexikographisches und Namenkundliches aus der christlichen Frühzeit Roms," *Philologus* 150 (2006): 232–250. For its usage in Jer. in particular, see R. Hennings, "Hieronymus zum Bischofsamt," *ZKG* 108 (1997): 1–11.

*ignominia omnium sacerdotum est propriis studere divitiis* *sacerdotes* here does not mean either 'bishops' or 'presbyters' exclusively but encompasses both meanings simultaneously (see on 7.3 *sacerdotes*), and I have accordingly translated it as 'priests'. Jer.'s point is that no holder of sacerdotal office should make the accumulation of wealth his personal goal (cf. on 5.3 *nego-*

*tiatorem clericum*). For his tirades against avaricious clergymen, see *comm. in Eccl.* 10.19 ll. 320, 329, 334, *comm. in Am.* 8.4 l. 102, *comm. in Agg.* 1.11 ll. 442–448, *comm. in Mt.* 21.13 l. 1341, *dial. adv. Pel.* 2.24, *epist.* 22.16.3, 40.2.2 *volo in nummarios invehi sacerdotes*, 60.11.3, 69.9.2–3; cf. Bodin, 347–348. Cf. Jul. Pom. *v. cont.* 2.13.2.

In late Latin the adjective *proprius* frequently is used, as it is here, in the sense of *suus*, *meus*, *tuus*, etc.; see Krebs-Schmalz, 2.408; J. Svennung, *Orosiana, syntaktische semasiologische und kristische Studien zu Orosius* (Uppsala, 1922), 65.

### 6.3

*natus ... delectant* This monologue is a fine example of ὑθοποιῖα (see Lausberg, § 820 ff., 1131 f.), a rhetorical device that Jer. employs further down at 16.3 (*ego fame torqueor et tu iudicas quantum ventri meo satis sit?*, with n.). By allowing the bumpkin-turned-gourmand to address the reader directly and reveal his character ostensibly through his own words—a technique employed in pagan satire (e.g. *Juv. sat.* 1.102–105)—, Jer. makes him appear more brash and insufferable than if he described him in the third person (cf. *epist.* 22.28.3). The one being impersonated is a clergyman: after making the blanket statement *ignominia omnium sacerdotum est propriis studere divitiis*, Jer. proceeds to offer brief but vividly drawn satiric case-studies in two types of moral reprobation in the contemporary clergy whose origins he traces ultimately to avarice: gourmandry (6.3) and legacy-hunting (6.4–5); he identifies these two as archetypal vices also at *epist.* 33.3.1 (*Paxamus et Apicius semper in manibus, oculi ad hereditates, sensus ad patinas*). He begins with the impoverished yokel who was reared on a meager peasant diet but later, after entering the priesthood and gaining the opportunity to move freely in high society (cf. *epist.* 22.16.3), became addicted to exotic foods and turned into a pretentious gastronome (not unlike the freedman Trimalchio in Petronius' *Satyrica*). This epicure vaunts his expertise in seafood and fowl in particular. Jer.'s parody runs along conventional lines, for Roman gourmands are frequently portrayed as being proud of the sources of their delicacies, both fish and fowl (*Hor. sat.* 2.4.31–34, 45–46; *Stat. silv.* 4.6.8–11). In a letter he wrote to Marcella in Rome Jer. mocks (clerical) critics of his biblical scholarship for the *diligentiam, qua avium salivas et concarum gurgites norunt* (*epist.* 27.1.3); he assails clerical gourmands also at *comm. in Mich.* 2.9–10 ll. 306–308, *epist.* 69.8.7; cf. Greg. Nys. *v. Mos.* 2.286. Cf. *epist.* 45.5.1, where he contrasts the rich diet of pagans and secularized Christians (including especially his clerical critics at Rome) with that of ascetics like himself: *tu*

*attagenam ructuas et de comeso acipensere gloriaris, ego faba ventrem inpleo.* Gregory of Nazianzus likewise praises the dietary abstemiousness of himself and his Nicene congregation at Constantinople: οὔτε τραπέξης ὄγκῳ φιλοτιμούμεθα, καὶ φαρμακείαις ταῖς ἀναισθήτου γαλοτιμούμεθα, καὶ φαρμακείαις ταῖς ἀναισθήτου γαστρός. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπαινοῦμέν τι τῶν μετὰ τὸν λαιμόν ὁμοτίμων, μᾶλλον δὲ, ἀτίμων ὁμοίως καὶ ἀποβλήτων· ἀλλὰ ζῶμεν οὕτως ἀπλῶς καὶ σχεδίως, καὶ μικρόν τι τῶν θηρίων, οἷς ὁ βίος ἄσκειος καὶ ἀνεπιτήδευτος, διαφέροντες (*orat.* 33.7).

*in paupere domo et in tugurio rusticano* In this elegant chiasmus *domus* means ‘home’ in the sense of ‘family’ or ‘household’ (cf. *OLD* sv *domus* 6a), while *tugurium* (cf. P. Baldi, “Latin *tugurium*,” *HSF* 110 [1997]: 241–247) refers to the actual physical structure, the peasant’s shack, in which the priest grew up; cf. *comm. in Is.* 8.24.7–13 l. 39, where the *tugurium* is a dwelling for *pauperes* (see also M. Prell, *Armut im antiken Rom* [Stuttgart, 1997], 130n110). The adjective *rusticanus* evokes the town-country polarity of Roman satire, on which, see S. Braund, “City and Country in Roman Satire,” in Ead. (ed.), *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome* (Exeter, 1989), 23–47. As such, the frugality of the priest’s upbringing, the wholesomeness of his rustic values, and the innocence and natural simplicity of his surroundings (this latter was a *desideratum* of Jer.’s own ascetic ideals in Rome; see e.g. *epist.* 43) stand in stark opposition to the luxurious feasting and the superficial sophistication of urban aristocratic culture that later become his obsession.

*milio* Peasant farmers ate food made with millet primarily when there was a shortage of other, more desirable foods. It was an ideal emergency resource in times of famine on account of its hardiness and drought-resistance; see P. Garnsey, *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World* (Cambridge, 1988), 52.

*cibario pane cibarius panis* was the cheapest and least nutritious of all breads (e.g. *Cels. medic.* 2.18; *Apul. met.* 6.20; cf. *TLL* III 1.1034.71 ff.). It served as a food ration for the army (*Cic. Tusc. disp.* 5.97), and it was eaten by slaves (*Isid. etym.* 20.2.15), poor rustic folk (*Jer. epist.* 54.12.1), and monks (*Jer. adv. Iov.* 1.40, *epist.* 52.12.1, 79.4.3). At *epist.* 43.3.1 Jer. calls ‘common bread’, milk, and hand-washed vegetables *deliciae rusticanae* and says that they *viles quidem sed innocentes cibos praebeant*. On bread as a staple of Roman diet, see e.g. N. Jasny, “The Daily Bread of the Ancient Greeks and Romans,” *Osiris* 9 (1950): 227–253.

*rugientem saturare ventrem* For the image of the growling belly satiated by simple peasant food, cf. Hor. *sat.* 2.2.17–18 *cum sale panis / latrantem stomachum bene leniet*.

*nunc* This adverb has an emphatic adversative sense here (i.e. ‘but now’); cf. on 1.2 *nunc iam*. At Hor. *sat.* 2.2.70–88 there is the same contrast between fare that once was bland (but healthy) but now is extravagant.

*similam* *simila* was the flour produced from *triticum* (cf. Cels. *medic.* 2.18).

*mella* The word *mella* originally was a poetic plural used by e.g. Horace (e.g. *carm.* 2.6.15, 3.16.33), Tibullus (*carm.* 1.3.45), Virgil (*Aen.* 1.432, *ecl.* 3.89, *georg.* 4.35), and Ovid (*am.* 3.8.40, *ars am.* 1.748, *fast.* 3.736). Columella (9.4, etc.) appears to have been the first author to employ the plural for the singular in prose. It recurs some twenty times in Jer.’s writings. In Roman times honey was most commonly used as a culinary sweetener (see e.g. D. Brothwell, *Food in Antiquity* [Baltimore, 1998], 73–80), but peasant farmers also enjoyed it raw for dessert or as a snack (André, 187). Athenaeus (*deipn.* 10.419) says that Pythagoras subsisted almost exclusively on honey.

*novi et genera et nomina piscium, in quo litore conca lecta sit calleo* Cf. *epist.* 33.3.1 *nostra saecula habent homines eruditos sciuntque, pisces in quo gurgite nati sint, quae concha in quo litore creverit*. In the Roman world the consumption of expensive fish was associated with high socio-economic status (J. Wilkins, “Social Status and Fish in Ancient Rome,” *FC&H* 1 [1993]: 191–203), and this is why, for instance, fish dishes are center-pieces of luxurious meals in Greek Middle and New Comedy (J. Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef: The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy* [Oxford, 2000], 293–304). Thus, the fact that Jer.’s clerical gastronome boasts of having a comprehensive knowledge of fish species implies that he has a diet rich in exotic varieties of seafood (for these varieties, see André, 95–113), and this in turn implies that he either is sufficiently well-off to be able to afford luxury dining on a regular basis or spends an inordinate amount of time attending banquets hosted by senatorial aristocrats, where such fare is served—or, more likely, it implies both. *conc(h)a* can refer generically to any type of shellfish, but here and in a great many other places it means ‘oyster’ (*OLD* sv *concha* 1b). Oysters were a favorite delicacy during the imperial period; cf. F. Brien-Poitevin, “Consummation des coquillages marins en Provence dans l’époque romaine,” *RAN* 29 (1996): 313–320. The wealthy in Rome ate expensive oysters, usually imported from abroad from places such as Rutupiae, modern Richborough,

on the eastern coast of Kent, England (cf. Plin. *mai. nat. hist.* 9.169, 32.62). Two other famous sources for choice oysters were closer to home for native Romans: the coast of Circeii, south of Rome (cf. Hor. *serm.* 2.4.33; Plin. *mai. nat. hist.* 32.60–63), and the Lucrine lake near Baiae, on the coast of Campania (cf. Juv. *sat.* 8.85–86; Plin. *mai. nat. hist.* 9.168–169). Less well-off Romans had access to cheaper oysters cultivated locally on Italian fish-farms; on the methods of cultivation, see G. Kron, “Husbandry, Hunting, Fishing and Pisciculture,” in J.P. Oleson (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Engineering and Technology in the Classical World* (New York, 2008), 175–222 (212–213).

*saporibus avium discerno provincias* The proper Roman gastronome was expected to be a master of detecting and appreciating the subtle flavors of his cuisine; cf. Hor. *sat.* 2.4.35–36 *nec sibi cenarum quivis temere arroget artem, / non prius exacta tenui ratione saporum*. For the many varieties of foreign and domestic fowl consumed by the Romans, see André, 127–133. The clerical glutton whom Jer. satirizes at *epist.* 22.28.5 has a nose sensitive to the smells of delicacies served in aristocratic households.

*ciborum me raritas ac novissime damna ipsa delectant* The Roman gourmand conventionally was portrayed as being on an endless quest to procure the finest and costliest of foods, see e.g. Petron. *sat.* 119, vv. 33–36; Juv. *sat.* 11.9–16; cf. the boast of the parasite Peniculus: *namque edo neque emo nisi quod est carissimum* (Plaut. *Men.* 106). Tertullian (*cult. fem.* 1.7; cf. 2.10) observes that *raritas* and *peregrinitas* are what make some things have more perceived value than others. Cf. Seneca’s disavowal of gourmandy: *placet cibis, quem nec parent familiae nec spectent, non ante multos imperatus dies nec multorum manibus ministratus, sed parabilis facilisque, nihil habens arcessiti pretiosive, ubilibet non defuturus, nec patrimonio nec corpori gravis, non rediturus qua intraverit* (*tranqu. anim.* 1.6). This disavowal is certainly affected, and indeed Seneca’s literary posturing as something of a philosophical ascetic seems rather ironic in view of his enormous wealth and extravagant lifestyle. Contemporary and posthumous critics recognized the discrepancy between the message and the man as he really was and accordingly branded him a hypocrite; see M. Griffin, *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics* (Oxford, 1976), 286–314.

#### 6.4

*audio* Jer. now shifts to his own authorial voice, which is to be distinguished from the clerical gourmand who has just finished his first-person

soliloquy (I have signified this distinction in the text by setting his words in quotation marks). Perhaps because he had been accused of being one himself in Rome less than a decade earlier (Cain 2009a, 114–124), Jer. self-consciously distances himself from the company of clerical legacy-hunters with this usage of *audio*: he only knows about them from hearsay (cf. *OLD* sv *audio* 9); this verb has a similar distancing effect below at 12.2.

*in senes et anus absque liberis* In late Republican and early imperial literature the male and female victims of inheritance-hunting are almost invariably geriatric, rich, and childless. See Hor. *epist.* 1.1.77–79; Ov. *ars am.* 2.271–272, 329; Sen. *cons. ad Marc.* 19.2, *epist.* 19.4, *ben.* 1.14.3; Plin. *mai. nat. hist.* 14.5; Stat. *silv.* 4.7.33–40; Juv. *sat.* 1.37–41, 3.128–130, 4.18–19, 6.548–550, 12.98–101; Mart. *epigr.* 2.32.6, 4.56, 6.27.9, 8.27.1, 11.44.1, 11.83.1; Tac. *Germ.* 20.5, *dial.* 6.2, *ann.* 13.52; Plin. *min. epist.* 4.15.3, 5.1.3; Plut. 497b–c; Lucian *dial. mort.* 15(5); Amm. Marc. 14.6.22, 28.4.22. According to Martial (*epigr.* 10.8), the older, the better: *nubere Paula cupit nobis, ego ducere Paulam / nolo: anus est. vellem si magis esset anus.*

*turpe servitium* Jer. draws special attention to the servile nature of the counterfeit clergyman's behavior by postponing *servitium* to the end of the period, with nine words (comprising twenty syllables) intervening between it and the verb of which it is the direct object. *Captatio* is frequently characterized as a form of slavery—e.g. *durissima servitus* (Cic. *par.* 39), *turpis servitus* (Sen. *ben.* 6.38.4), *servitus* (Plin. *mai. nat. hist.* 14.5); cf. Arr. *Epict.* 4.1.148 θεραπεύοντος ὡς δούλου—because the *captator*, despite being (almost always) a *free* person, acts out the role of slave, catering to his prey's every whim.

*ipsi* In secular Roman society *captatores* came in all varieties and included not only people from the lower classes but also career lawyers like Regulus (Plin. *min. epist.* 2.20), praetors (Juv. *sat.* 3.128–130), and citizens from the highest echelon of the social hierarchy (*splendidissimi homines*, Tac. *dial.* 6). Jer.'s *ipsi* are captating priests, presumably those of humble origins (cf. 5.3 *negotiatorem clericum et ex inope divitem et ex ignobili gloriosum*). He does not explicitly identify them as clerics (above he refers to the offenders using only the vague but insinuating *quorundam*) because he expects his audience to recognize that these gold-diggers are a second illustration offered by him, after the gourmand, of the hopelessly corrupt element within the contemporary clergy.

*apponunt matulam* That this activity is juxtaposed by Jer.'s reference to the *turpe servitium* of the *captatores* is fitting, inasmuch as in Roman society it was the slaves who had the ignominious task of fetching for the master the chamber-pot for urination (*matula/matella*) and then of emptying it and cleaning it (see e.g. Petron. *sat.* 27.3 *duo spadones in diversa parte circuli stabant, quorum alter matellam tenebat argenteam*). At Jer. *epist.* 117.8.2 a lecherous priest performs this menial duty for his 'virgin' paramour.

*obsident lectum* One of the *captator's* main *officia*, as mentioned in the literary sources, is sitting by the prey's bed and attending to his or her every need. See Cic. *par.* 39; Ov. *ars am.* 2.329–332; Sen. *ben.* 4.20.3; Plin. *min. epist.* 2.20.2–5; cf. Plaut. *mil. glori.* 705–709; Ambr. *exp. Ps.* 118 8.54, 9.21; Jer. *epist.* 117.8.2.

*purulentias stomachi et phlegmata pulmonis manu propria suscipiunt* Wiesen, 77, opines that these lurid details "are patently the products of Jerome's vivid imagination". This, however, is an overstatement, for the image of the strong-stomached *captator* wiping away nasal and other discharge from his decrepit and terminally ill victim is conventional in satiric portrayals of his activities (see Juv. *sat.* 10.198–202; Mart. *epigr.* 1.10; Arr. *Epict.* 4.1.148; cf. Mart. *epigr.* 2.26.1–2, where Naevia's sputum hurls into Bithynicus' lap). Jer.'s description is unapologetically graphic, and indeed its grotesqueness is itself a satiric technique designed to instill in the reader a sense of pure revulsion, both physical and moral, for the shamelessness of the clerical *captatores*. On Martial's literary portrayal of disease as a means to make critiques of contemporary social realities such as *captatio*, see M. Mans, "Humour, Health and Disease in Martial," *Akroterion* 39 (1994): 105–120; cf. K. Higuchi, "Captatio as depicted by Martial," *JCS* 1 (1953): 27–35.

While *purulentus* is by no means uncommon in classical Latin literature, especially in medical contexts, its noun-form *purulentia* evidently is first attested in Tertullian (*pall.* 5), who uses it in the plural as a term of derision for self-indulgent Roman politicians. It is next found in Jer., who appears to be the only other Latin patristic author to employ it. It occurs here and on four other occasions in his works (*comm. in Is.* 1.1.6 l. 28, *comm. in Hiez.* 12.40.35–42 l. 986, *comm. in Os.* 2.6.1–3 l. 29, *comm. in Naum* 3.1–4 l. 78 [here, as in the letter to Nepotian, it is paired with phlegm coughed up from the lungs]). In the present instance *purulentias stomachi* does not refer to excrement (*pace* Wright, 207) but to gastric juices (e.g. bile) which are vomited up; I have rendered it generically as "gastric phlegm".

*pavent ad introitum medici ... an commodius habeant sciscitantur* The subject of *habeant* is the elderly patient, even though in the next two sentences he is referenced in the singular (*senex*; *senem*). For the idiom *commodius habere* ('to convalesce'), see *TLL* III ix.1926.51ff. Cf. the *captator*'s anxious questioning of the physicians about the welfare of the *captatus*, according to Arr. *Epict.* 4.1.148: ἄμα δ' ἀποθανεῖν εὐχομένου καὶ τοὺς ἰατροὺς διακρίνοντος, εἰ ἤδη θανάσιμωσ ἔχουσιν. See also Plin. min. *epist.* 2.20.7–8, for the inheritance-hunting lawyer Regulus' dealings with the personal doctors of Velleius Blaesus.

*tremantibusque labiis* Quivering lips are a symptom of emotional agitation also at c. Ioh. 11, *comm. in Tit.* 1.6–7 l. 411, *epist.* 117.5.2.

*et si paululum senex vegetior fuerit periclitantur ac simulata laetitia mens intrinsecus avara torquetur* With the verb *periclitari*, which as a clinal term means to be dangerously ill (D.R. Langslow, *Medical Latin in the Roman Empire* [Oxford, 2000], 162), Jer. creates a stunning antithesis between the miraculously convalescent elderly man (*senex vegetior*) and his predator who has all of a sudden become 'ill' due to his distress. His characterization is fully conventional. In classical literature the *captator* secretly longs for his victim to die (e.g. Mart. *epigr.* 6.63.7–8, 8.27.1–2, 12.40.5–6, 12.56), and he therefore is ecstatic whenever the *captatus* seems to be on death's door (Hor. *sat.* 2.5.106–109; Juv. *sat.* 12.98–130; Petron. *sat.* 117.9; Mart. *epigr.* 2.26, 5.39.5–6). He accordingly is agitated by last-minute recoveries (Sen. *ben.* 6.38.4; Mart. *epigr.* 12.90), yet he feigns happiness at the convalescence (cf. Hor. *sat.* 2.5.93–95; Lucian *dial. mort.* 15[5]) so as to give the impression that he actually wants his victim to outlive him (see Cic. *off.* 3.74; Mart. *epigr.* 12.90; Lucian *dial. mort.* 18[8]). Moreover, like the *captator* portrayed in classical Latin literature, for whom deception is a stock-in-trade (cf. Mart. *epigr.* 11.55.3 *ars est captandi quod nolis velle videri*), Jer.'s is a crafty schemer (cf. Ambr. *off.* 3.58).

On the proverbial greed of *captatores* (Jer.'s *mens intrinsecus avara*), see e.g. Hor. *sat.* 2.5.56; Mart. *epigr.* 6.63.1. That envy inwardly torments the one who harbors it is a patristic commonplace. See Cyp. *zel. et liv.* 6–11; Ps.-Phocyl. *sent.* 70–75; Bas. *hom. de inv.* 1; Greg. Naz. *orat.* 36.4; Jer. *epist.* 108.19.8; John Chrys. *virg.* 52, *hom. in Mt.* 40.4 (PG 57:443); Cyr. Alex. *comm. in Is.* (PG 70:1305), *exp. in Ps.* (PG 69:756); Nil. Anc. *perist.* 12.1 (PG 79:940); Jul. Pom. *v. cont.* 3.5, 3.9.1–2; Caes. *serm.* 90.5, 193.1; Anon. *Anth. Gr.* 10.111. John Cassian likens the pricks of envy to the stings of a basilisk (*inst.* 5.21, *coll.* 18.16), while Caesarius calls envy a deadly poison (*serm.* 16.2, 85.5, 200.5, 225.2), and Peter



Chrysologus refers to it as *criminum virus, peccatorum mater, origo vitiorum* (*serm.* 48.5).

### 6.5

*timent enim ne perdant ministerium* The apprehension that their prey will outlive them or refuse to write them into their wills, thereby rendering all of their efforts pointless, frequently is attributed in the sources to *captatores* (e.g. Mart. *epigr.* 2.65, 5.39, 6.63, 7.66, 9.9, 9.48). Jer.'s use of *ministerium* to describe the clerical legacy-hunter's scheming enterprise is ironic; by the late fourth century this was a standard term for ministry in the church (Gryson, 119–120).

*vivacem senem Mathusalae annis comparant* Here *vivax* = 'tenacious of life' (cf. *OLD* sv *vivax* 1a). Methusaleh, the son of Enoch, died at the age of 969 (Gen. 5:27) and was the longest living of the antediluvian patriarchs. His name is synonymous with great longevity elsewhere in Jer.'s works (*tract. in Ps.* 89 ll. 65–66, *epist.* 60.14.3).

*o quanta apud dominum merces si in praesenti pretium non sperarent! quantis sudoribus hereditas cassa expetitur! minori labore margaritum Christi emi poterat* For a similar notion, cf. John Chrys. *hom. in Mt.* 67.5 (PG 57:638); Aug. *epist.* 203.1. Jer. sets the proper tone for this passage with an interjection lamenting the vanity of the clerical *captator's* pursuit of riches (cf. *OLD* sv *o* 2; he uses *o* in this sense also at e.g. *epist.* 60.13.1, 109.1.2, 123.15.2, 147.7.1). The reference to the purchasing of the *margaritum Christi* is an allusion, which Hilberg missed, to the short parable about the Pearl of Great Price (Mt. 13:45–46): a merchant in search of the choicest pearls finds the pearl of the Gospel and sells all that he has so that he may buy it. The legacy-hunting clergyman, then, should mimic the merchant from the parable by renouncing his wealth—or rather, his futile attempts to amass worldly wealth—so that he may store up riches of an entirely different kind in heaven. At *epist.* 125.4 Jer. alludes to this same parable when he impresses upon the Gallic monk Rusticus that just as merchants of the world brave every form of danger in their pursuit of transient wealth, so should the monk completely self-dispossess in order to purchase the pearl of Christ. Likewise, at Anon. *hist. mon.* 14.18 Paphnutius is told by God that, on account of his quest for personal virtue, he resembles the merchant in this parable (cf. Theod. *hist. rel.* 10.1). The willingness of merchants risk their own personal safety in their pursuit of wealth is, in addition to a contemporary social reality, a patristic literary *topos*; see

e.g. *apoph. patr.* Syncletica 10 (PG 65:425); Greg. Naz. *orat.* 2.100, 32.13; Jer. *comm. in Abac.* 2.3.7 ll. 410–415; John Chrys. *hom. in Mt.* 23.9, 38.4, 49.5, 59.5 (PG 57:319, 433, 502, 580–581); Aug. *serm.* 38; John Cass. *coll.* 1.2.

*sperarent* Hilberg has the singular *speraret*, but I have emended this to *sperarent*, both on the authority of *B* and because it better accords with the logic of the passage: the subject is clerical legacy-hunters, the subject also of the three plural verbs (*timent*, *perdant*, *comparant*) in the previous sentence.

## Chapter 7

Jer. first addresses the intellectual and spiritual preparation and diligence that Nepotian must bring to his office. He should immerse himself in Scriptural study and be firmly grounded in orthodox theology so that he can ably instruct his flock in the word of truth. He must also be sure always to practice what he preaches, lest by his hypocrisy he scandalize his congregation and relinquish his status as a moral authority. Jer. enjoins Nepotian to honor his bishop, yet by the same token he emphasizes that bishops are obliged to love and respect their priests like sons. He argues that the bishop and priest are in fact on an equal footing in the sense that they are both ministers of sacramental grace, and he strongly denounces episcopal tyranny and haughtiness, directing his words less at Nepotian (and his fellow priests) than at imperious bishops who abuse their authority.

## 7.1

*divinas scripturas saepius lege* Jer. warmly recommends Scriptural reading to other spiritual advisees as well (*epist.* 22.17.2, 54.11.1, 79.9.2, 107.12.2, 128.4.2); cf. Bas. *epist.* 42.3. Ambrose also urges his clergy to set aside sufficient time for intensive study of the Bible (*off.* 1.88, 100), and Augustine likewise says that preachers should be exceptionally well-versed in the biblical text (*doctr. chr.* 4.5). Jer. later praised Nepotian for having studied Scripture and the writings of various Latin Fathers so assiduously that he had made his mind “a library of Christ” (*epist.* 60.10.9).

*immo numquam de manibus tuis sacra lectio deponatur* Following the epidiorthotic *immo*, whereby he retracts his first injunction only to replace it with a more strongly worded one, Jer. employs a Ciceronian locution; cf. *acad. pr.* 1.3 *nec de manibus umquam deponere*. Here, as at *epist.* 58.6.2 (*semper in manu tua sacra sit lectio*—undoubtedly an echo of Cyp. *epist.* 79.9.2 *semper in manibus tuis divina sit lectio*), the phrase *sacra lectio* is synonymous in most cases with *divina lectio* (cf. on 3.8 *divina lectione*) and stands for the Bible as a physical artifact, as opposed, that is, to the act of reading Scripture (cf. Kasch, 117–118), which is the sense of *scripturarum lectio* at 8.1.

*disce quod doceas* *quod* here is pronominal rather than final, hence “Learn what you teach”, not “Learn that you may teach”. Jer. would later give the same advice to Rusticus in *epist.* 125 (8.2 *discas quod possis docere* [he pro-

ceeds to direct his correspondent to take the letter to Nepotian as his trusted guidebook, should he entertain clerical aspirations], 18.1 *multo tempore discere quod doceas*; cf. 66.9.1 *sentio te ... nec temeritate quorundam docere quod nescias, sed ante discere quod docturus es*); cf. Cic. *nat. deo.* 2.148 [*vis eloquendi*] *efficit ut et ea quae ignoramus discere et ea quae scimus alios docere possimus*. As is clear from the nature of the precepts that immediately precede as well as follow this one, what Jer. enjoins Nepotian to 'learn' is sound doctrine, apprehension of which is predicated upon the proper interpretation of Scripture. M. Testard, "Jérôme et Ambroise: Sur un 'aveu' du *De officiis* de l'évêque de Milan," in Duval, 227–254 (239–240), saw in Jer.'s injunction an allusive critique of Ambrose's confession of his own lack of theological preparation for the episcopate at *off.* 1.3–4 (... *ut docendi studio possim discere. unus enim verus magister est, qui solus non didicit quod omnes doceret; homines autem discunt prius quod doceant ... ego enim raptus de tribunalibus atque administrationis infulis ad sacerdotium, docere vos coepi quod ipse non didici. itaque factum est ut prius docere inciperem quam discere. discendum igitur mihi simul et docendum est quoniam non vacavit ante discere*), but N. Adkin, "Jerome, Ambrose and Gregory Nazianzen (Jerome, *Epist.* 52, 7–8)," *Vichiana* 4 (1993): 294–300 (297–299), has convincingly refuted Testard's suggestion. Adkin, *ibid.*, 299, also calls attention to the 'highly elaborate structure' of the passage, observing that *discere quod doceas* is immediately followed by two Scriptural citations (Tit. 1:9 and 2 Tim. 3:14) which reinforce this pithy exhortation in terms of their chiasmic form (*obtinere eum ... revincere* and *permanere ... didiceris*) and diction (i.e. the noun *doctrina* occurs twice in the first citation and the verb *discere* occurs twice in the second); moreover, the verb *discere* (*discere ... didiceris*) neatly encloses the entire passage.

*obtinere eum qui secundum doctrinam est fidelem sermonem ut possis exhortari in doctrina sana et contradicentes revincere* Jer. is paraphrasing Paul's words to Titus about the bishop's theological qualifications (Tit. 1:9 *amplectentem eum qui secundum doctrinam est fidelem sermonem ut potens sit et exhortari in doctrina sana et eos qui contradicunt arguere*). Jer. cites this verse to demonstrate that personal holiness is not enough for the priest to successfully discharge the duties of his office: he must be well versed in Scripture and have impeccable theological orthodoxy so that he will be able properly to instruct his flock. Cf. John Chrys. *sacerd.* 3.15, 4.8–9; Aug. *mor. eccl. cath.* 1.1; Leo *serm.* 1.1; Jul. Pom. *v. cont.* 1.18; see also Greg. Naz. *orat.* 2.47, 21.9, for criticism of clergymen who only begin to study the faith when they are ordained.

*permane in his quae didicisti et credita sunt tibi, sciens a quo didiceris* 2Tim. 3:14. Jer. quotes this verse, in conjunction with Tit. 1:9 (see previous n.), also in *epist.* 53.3.2–3.

*paratus semper ad satisfactionem omni poscenti te rationem de ea quae in te est spe* An exact quotation of 1Pet. 3:15b, except that Jer. replaces *parati* with the singular *paratus*; this is the last of three NT passages that he quotes or paraphrases in quick succession, but without identifying their biblical origin, which he clearly expects his reader to recognize. Possidius invoked this verse to praise Augustine's preparedness as a preacher (v. *Aug.* 9.1).

## 7.2

*non confundant opera sermonem tuum, ne cum in ecclesia loqueris tacitus quilibet respondeat: "cur ergo haec ipse non facis?"* This notion that a figure of spiritual authority loses credibility if he fails to practice what he preaches is widely attested in patristic literature. Some illustrative examples may be cited: Polyc. *epist. ad Php.* 11.2; Bas. *reg. mor.* 70.9, 10, 37; Greg. Naz. *orat.* 2.71; John Chrys. *sacerd.* 5.3; Ambr. *off.* 2.86–90, *epist.* 1.6.2; Jer. *comm. in Agg.* 1.11 ll. 446–447, *comm. in Tit.* 1.6–7 ll. 300–303, *epist.* 69.8.4 *perdit enim auctoritatem docendi, cuius sermo opere destruitur*; Aug. *doctr. chr.* 4.27 *quod mihi praecipis, cur ipse non facis? ita fit, ut eum non oboedienter audiant, qui se ipse non audit, et dei verbum, quod eis praedicatur, simul cum ipso praedicatore contemnant*; Jul. Pom. v. *cont.* 1.15, 1.20.1 *nisi me fallit opinio, sancte vivendum est sacerdotii ne dicta sua repugnantibus factis evacuet; si quod praedicat fieri debere non faciat aut si quod non facit praedicare praesumpserit. si autem aliter egerit, nihil apud eos qui eius vitam novere proficit, 2.4.2*; Leo *serm.* 2.1–2. Thus Chrysostom's stern assessment of the priest who leads a worldly life: ἄν ταῦτα ποιῇ, καὶ ἐγὼ κατηγορῶ, καὶ οὐ φείδομαι, ἀλλ' ἀνάξιον αὐτὸν εἶναι τῆς ἱερωσύνης φημί. πῶς γὰρ ἑτέροις δυνήσεται παραινεῖν μὴ περὶ τὰ περιττὰ ταῦτα ἐσχολαχένας, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ παραινέσαι μὴ δυνάμενος; (*hom. 9 in Php.* [PG 62:251]). On the damage that hypocritical clergymen do to the church's morale by their double lives, see Ps.-Cyp. *sing. cler.* 7 *blasphemiam ingerit religioni quam coluit, qui quod confitetur non ante omnes inpleverit*; Bas. *epist.* 44.1; Jer. *comm. in Agg.* 1.11 ll. 442–443. In Nepotian's case, being above reproach is all the more incumbent in view of his monastic vocation (cf. Eugipp. *comment.* v. Sev. 43.6 *mores ... proposito suscepto consentiant: grande nefas est peccata sectari etiam hominem saecularem, quanto magis monachos ... quorum incessus et habitus virtutis creditur esse documentum?*).

That one's deeds should mirror one's profession of belief is likewise a *topos* of ancient philosophical literature and patristic moral exhortation. For numerous references, see A. Festugière, "Lieux communs littéraires et thèmes de folk-lore dans l'hagiographie primitive," *WS* 73 (1960): 123–152 (140–142). To Festugière's rather lean inventory may be added the following references: Philo *v. Mos.* 1.29 τὰ φιλοσοφίας δόγματα διὰ τῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἔργων ἐπεδείκνυτο, λέγων μὲν οἷα ἐφρόνει, πράττων δὲ ἀκόλουθα τοῖς λεγομένοις εἰς ἀρμονίαν λόγου καὶ βίου, ἵν' οἷος ὁ λόγος τοιοῦτος ὁ βίος καὶ οἷος ὁ βίος τοιοῦτος ὁ λόγος ἐξετάζωνται; *Cyp. bon. pat.* 3 *nos autem, fratres dilectissimi, qui philosophi non verbis sed factis sumus, nec vestitu sapientiam sed veritate praeferimus, qui virtutum conscientiam magis quam iactantiam novimus, qui non loquimur magna sed vivimus ...; apoph. patr.* Isidorus 1 (PG 65:223) εἰ δὲ καὶ λόγος καὶ βίος συνδράμοι, ἐν φιλοσοφίας ἀπάσης ἀποτελοῦσιν ἄγαλμα, Moyses 17 (PG 65:288) ἐὰν μὴ συμφωνήσῃ ἡ πράξις μετὰ τῆς εὐχῆς, εἰς μάτην κοπιᾷ; *Bas. epist.* 42.4 πολλῶν μὲν ἀκήκοα λόγων ψυχωφελῶν· πλὴν παρ' οὐδενὶ τῶν διδασκάλων εὗρον ἀξίαν τῶν λόγων τὴν ἀρετὴν; *Greg. Nys. v. Greg. Thaum.* p. 14 Heil, *virg.* 23.1 πᾶς λόγος δίχα τῶν ἔργων θεωρούμενος, κἂν ὅτι μάλιστα κεκαλλωπισμένος τύχῃ, εἰκόνι ἔοικεν ἀψύχῳ ἐν βαφαῖς καὶ χρώμασιν εὐανθῇ τινα χαρακτῆρα προδεικνυοῦσῃ· ὁ δὲ ποιῶν καὶ διδάσκων, καθὼς φησὶ που τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, οὗτος ἀληθῶς ζῶν ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὠραίος τῷ κάλλει καὶ ἐνεργὸς καὶ κινούμενος; *Greg. Naz. orat.* 2.69; *Jer. comm. in Agg.* 1.11 ll. 446–447 *quorum saepe vita et sermo incongruus scandalizat plurimos et de ecclesia eicit, comm. in Tit.* 1.10–11 ll. 569–572 *qui ecclesiae futurus est princeps habeat eloquentiam cum vitae integritate sociatam, ne opera absque sermone sint tacita et dicta, factis deficientibus, erubescant, comm. in Tit.* 2.1 ll. 17–18, *epist.* 79.2.4, 125.7.1 *ne habitus sermoque dissentiat*, 133.13.3; *Anon. hist. mon.* 8.16, 60; *John Chrys. hom. in Act.* 3.5 (PG 60:41) αὕτη γὰρ μείζων ἡ διδασκαλία ἢ διὰ πραγμάτων; *Aug. enarr. in Ps.* 30 2.2.3 *quis non irascatur, videns homines confitentes ore deum, negantes moribus?*; *Pall. hist. Laus.* 47.13–14 δεῖ γὰρ τὸν πιστὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν φρονεῖν μὲν ἃ δίδωσιν ὁ θεός, λαλεῖν δὲ ἃ φρονεῖ, ποιεῖν δὲ ἃ λαλεῖ. ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τῶν λόγων ἢ τοῦ βίου συντρέχῃ συγγένεια, ἄρτος ἐστὶν ἄνευ ἁλός; *Salv. ad eccl.* 3.18.80; *Theod. hist. rel.* 17.8 τῇ δὲ διδασκαλίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ ἐπιμελείᾳ καὶ αἱ τοῦ βίου λαμπηδόνες συνηγόρου; *Jul. Pom. v. cont.* 1.17 *eamque esse summam perfectamque doctrinam quam conversatio spiritualis ostenderit, non quam inanis sermo iactitarit, nec a nobis in die iudicii verba quaerenda sed opera, nec facile persuaderi esse possibile quod docet lingua, si a lingua vita dissentiat*; *Caes. Arel. serm.* 75.2 *consentiant simul voces et mores*; *Anon. v. Desid. Cad.* 21 *ne sermones eius vel in modico contraria confunderent opera. The concordet sermo cum vita* notion (Seneca's phrase; *epist.* 75.4) is a *leit-motif* of Gregory the Great's *Regula pastoralis* (lib. 1 praef., 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 3.40).

According to Chrysostom (*hom. 3 in 1 Cor.* [PG 61:28–29], *hom. 4 in 1 Cor.* [PG 58:38]), consistency of word with deed in the life of the Christian is a powerful evangelistic tool for winning over the non-Christian. For reproaches of clerics and especially monks who renounce the world in word but not in deed, see Greg. Nys. *virg.* 23; Jer. *epist.* 22.16.2, 58.2.1, 125.16.1; Aug. *epist.* 85.2; *serm. dom.* 2.41; John Cass. *coll.* 4.20; Jul. Pom. *v. cont.* 2.4.2. On deeds speaking louder than words, see Eus. *hist. eccl.* 8.14.17; cf. R. Lim, “By Word or by Deed: Two Modes of Religious Persuasion in Late Antiquity,” in M. Dillon (ed.), *Religion in the Ancient World* (Amsterdam, 1996), 257–269.

Closely related to this theme is the recurring antithesis in patristic literature between empty appearance and substance in regard to personal piety. See e.g. Ign. *epist. ad Magn.* 4.1 πρέπον οὖν ἐστὶν μὴ μόνον καλεῖσθαι Χριστιανούς, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἶναι; Cyp. *hab. virg.* 5 *virgo non esse tantum sed et intellegi debet et credi: nemo cum virginem viderit, dubitet an virgo sit* (Cyprian is likely echoing Tert. *cult. fem.* 2.13 *pudicitiae Christianae satis non est esse, verum et videri*); Greg. Naz. *orat.* 7.10, 43.21, 43.60 εἶναι γάρ, οὐ δοκεῖν, ἐσπούδαζεν ἄριστος; *de vita sua* 321–323 τοῦτ’ ἦν μέρος μοι φιλοσόφου παιδεύσεως / τὸ μὴ δοκεῖν τὸν πρῶτον ἐκπονεῖν βίον, / εἶναι δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ δοκεῖν θεῷ φίλον; Jer. *epist.* 58.7.2 *esse Christianum grande est, non videri*, 82.6.1, 125.7.1; Pelag. *epist. ad Celant.* 20.2 *aliud enim virtutem habere, aliud virtutis similitudinem; aliud est rerum umbram sequi, aliud veritatem*; Jul. Pom. *v. cont.* 2.24.2 *magni student videri, non fieri* (cf. 1.13.2).

*delicatus magister est qui pleno ventre de ieiuniis disputat* Jer. later repeated this aphoristic formulation, along with its antithetical juxtaposition of a stomach full and empty (the latter is implied by *ieiunia*), in a letter to Paulinus, in the context of pointing out the hypocrisy of renouncing one’s riches yet still holding onto a portion of them: *plenus venter facile de ieiuniis disputat* (*epist.* 58.2.2; cf. 127.4.3 *frustra que lingua praedicat paupertatem et docet elemosynas, qui Croesi divitiis tumet vilique opertus palliolo pugnat contra tineas vestium sericarum*). Cf. Jer.’s criticism of some contemporary church leaders: *an non confusio et ignominia est, Iesum crucifixum, magistrum, pauperem atque esurientem fartis praedicare corporibus, ieiuniorumque doctrinam, rubentes buccas, tumentiaque ora proferre?* (*comm. in Mich.* 2.9–10 ll. 313–316). Cf. also Cicero’s diatribe against hypocritical philosophers who set themselves up as *magistri* in matters in which they themselves have yet to gain proper expertise: *videre licet alios tanta levitate et iactatione, ut iis fuerit non didicisse melius, alios pecuniae cupidos, gloriae non nullos, multos libidinum servos, ut cum eorum vita mirabiliter pugnet oratio; quod quidem mihi videtur esse turpissimum. ut enim si grammaticum se professus quispiam*

*barbare loquatur aut si absurde canat is, qui se haberi velit musicum, hoc turpior sit, quod in eo ipso peccet, cuius profiteatur scientiam, sic philosophus in vitae ratione peccans hoc turpior est, quod in officio, cuius magister esse vult, labitur artemque vitae professus delinquit in vita* (*Tusc. disp.* 2.11–12). See further *Sen. epist.* 52.8 *eligamus ... eos, qui vita docent, qui cum dixerunt quid faciendum sit probant faciendo, qui docent quid vitandum sit nec umquam in eo quod fugiendum dixerunt deprehenduntur*; John Chrys. *hom. in Mt.* 72.1 (PG 58:668) τί γὰρ διδασκάλου γένοιτ' ἂν ἀθλιώτερον, ὅταν τοὺς μαθητὰς τὸ μὴ προσέχειν αὐτοῦ τῷ βίῳ διασώζη; ὥστε ἡ δοκοῦσα αὐτῶν εἶναι τιμὴ, μεγίστη κατηγορία ἐστίν, ὅταν τοιοῦτον φαίνωνται βίον ἔχοντες, ὃν οἱ ζηλοῦντες διαφθεύονται; John Cass. *coll.* 4.20. The man who fails to practice what he preaches is likened by Abba Poemen to a spring which cleanses and gives drink to everyone else but cannot purify itself (*apoph. patr.* Poemen 25 [PG 65:328]).

*accusare avaritiam et latro potest* Thieves are proverbially greedy; see *Cyp. zel. et liv.* 7; *Heliod. Aeth.* 1.3.3; *Greg. Naz. orat.* 14.6 κλεπτῶν ἀπληστία; cf. *Didache* 3.5. Jer.'s example of the *latro* may have been lifted from one of Cicero's *Verrines* (2.3.4) in which he emphasizes that critics of others' behavior must be absolutely innocent of the accusations that they foist upon others (*furem aliquem aut rapacem accusaris: vitanda tibi semper erit omnis avaritiae suspicio*).

*sacerdotis Christi mens osque concordent* Jer. reiterates the need for absolute moral transparency (cf. above *non confundant opera sermonem tuum*) on the part of the *sacerdos* (both presbyter and bishop; see on 7.3 *sacerdotes*), thereby duly emphasizing the importance of his point and stylishly, by ring composition (*non confundant ... concordent*), marking off the passage consisting of both statements and the intervening material as a tightly packaged thematic unit. For the *mens-os* synergy, see *Ambr. myst.* 9.54 *quod os loquitur, mens interna fateatur*; cf. *Orig. hom. in Lev.* 5.8; *Jer. epist.* 54.13.2 *speculum mentis est facies et taciti oculi cordis fatentur arcana*.

*esto subiectus pontifici tuo* Ignatius was the first Christian author to elaborate on the responsibility of the lower clergy (and the laity) to submit to the authority of the bishop (*epist. ad Eph.* 4.1, 5.3, *epist. ad Magn.* 13.2, *epist. ad Trall.* 13.2, *epist. ad Smyrn.* 8.1) and obey him as they would the Lord himself (*epist. ad Eph.* 6.1, *epist. ad Magn.* 3.1, *epist. ad Trall.* 2.1–2). According to Jer., clerical subordinates must submit to the authority of their bishop, but by the same token he must in turn treat them respectfully (see on 7.3 *episcopi ... deferatur*). On *pontifex* as 'bishop', see on 4.4 *pontifex Christi*.



*quasi animae parentem suspice* Priests are the spiritual ‘sons’ of bishops in Greg. Naz. *orat.* 21.9; Ambr. *off.* 1.2, 24; 2.121, 123, 134; Jer. *epist.* 82.3.1, 82.11.4, 147.10.1. For the notion of spiritual paternity, see further 1 Cor. 4.15; 2 Cor. 6.13; 1 Thess. 2.11; Phil. 2.22; 1 Tim. 1.2; 2 Tim. 2.1; Tit. 1.4; Phlm. 10; 1 Pet. 5.13; 3 Jn. 4. Jer. transferred the same principle of paternal reverence to the monastery; cf. *epist.* 125.15.2 *praepositum monasterii timeas ut dominum, diligas ut parentem* (see also Aug. *epist.* 211.15). On bishops as father-figures, see further P.-G. Alves de Sousa, *El Sacerdocio ministerial en los libros De sacerdotio de san Juan Crisostomo* (Pamplona, 1975), 182–184.

*amare filiorum, timere servorum est* This formulation, which derives its charm and potency from its gnomic quality as well as from perfect parison, isocolon, and twofold antithesis (i.e. loving vs. fearing and sons vs. slaves), would appear to have been inspired by Lact. *div. inst.* 4.4.2 *deus autem, qui unus est, quoniam utramque personam sustinet et patris et domini, et amare eum debemus, quia filii sumus, et timere, quia servi*; on Jer.’s use of Lactantius as a literary model, see Cain 2009d, with references to further bibliography. Later, in a letter to Bishop Theophilus, Jer. recycled a modified, expanded form of this pithy construction: *amari enim debet parens, amari parens et episcopus, non timeri* (*epist.* 82.3.1).

*“et si pater sum,” inquit, “ubi est honor meus? et si dominus ego sum, ubi est timor meus?”* This passage is marked off as a quotation by *inquit*. It is a quotation of Mal. 1:6b–c, where the Lord, speaking in his own voice, reproves the corrupt priests of Israel who have failed to honor and respect him as their God. Since *inquit* at first glance seems to lack a proper subject, some translators have furnished it with one which acknowledges the biblical origin of the saying: e.g. Labourt, 2.182: “dit Dieu”; Wright, 209: “says the Scripture”. The implied subject, however, is in fact ‘bishop’ (*pontifex*), for the quotation looks back to *esto subiectus pontifici tuo et quasi animae parentem suspice*. The line also neatly parallels the immediately preceding apophthegm *amare filiorum, timere servorum est*, with *pater ... honor* corresponding to *amare filiorum*, and *dominus—timor* to *timere servorum*. In its original biblical context *dominus* means ‘Lord’, but here it must mean ‘master’ in order for its parallelism with ‘slaves’ (*servorum*) to be maintained. This is the only time that Jer. applies Mal. 1:6b–c to hierarchical relations within the church, and indeed he appears to be unique among the Fathers in this application. Elsewhere he has it refer to the disposition that the believer should have towards God (*comm. in Is.* 4.11.1–3 ll. 78–83, *comm. in Mal.* 1.6–7 ll. 159–188, *comm. in Eph.* lib. 3 p. 570), an interpretation that

may well have been suggested to him by Origen (*orat.* 22.1, *comm. in Ioh.* 1.29.203).

### 7.3

*plura tibi in eodem viro observanda sunt nomina: monachus, pontifex, avunculus* The phrase *in eodem viro* of course refers to Heliodorus (cf. *epist.* 60.7.3 *tu et avunculus et episcopus, hoc est et in carne et in spiritu pater*), to whom Jer. gives designations in descending order of importance in the spiritual realm: he places *monachus* first since his principal argument in the letter to Nepotian is that an authentic monastic lifestyle is a non-negotiable precondition for the clerical vocation.

*sed et episcopi sacerdotes se sciant esse, non dominos. honorent clericos quasi clericos ut et ipsis a clericis quasi episcopis deferatur* Jer. achieves clarity and poignancy, in this first sentence, through positive-negative arsis-thesis (on the relative infrequency of this form of arsis-thesis in patristic literature, see M.I. Barry, *St. Augustine, the Orator: A Study of the Rhetorical Qualities of St. Augustine's Sermones ad populum* [Washington, 1924], 29; Hritz, 5). This effect is only magnified by the very striking initial-sequent and initial-interior sibilant alliteration (*sed et episcopi sacerdotes se sciant esse*).

Some six years later Jer. expressed a similar sentiment to the one captured in these two sentences when venting to Bishop Theophilus of Alexandria his exasperation at Bishop John of Jerusalem's imperiousness: *ut pontifices Christi ... non dominorum metu, sed patrum honore veneremur, ut deferamus episcopis quasi episcopis ... contenti sint honore suo et patres se sciant esse, non dominos, maxime apud eos, qui spretis ambitionibus saeculi nihil quieti et otio praeferunt* (*epist.* 82.11.4–5). Earlier in this same letter (3.2) he holds up Theophilus as the model of episcopal equity because he treats monks (i.e. Jer.'s monks at Bethlehem) with respect and in turn is adored by them. By the time Jer. wrote to Nepotian in mid-393, the hostilities between John and himself, which formed part of the opening chapter of the Origenist controversy in Palestine, had already begun to escalate to such a degree as to warrant our suspicion that his diocesan bishop may be targeted allusively in the present passage, though by the same token this expressed distaste for episcopal superciliousness here in the letter to Nepotian could just as well have been motivated by his extreme personal sensitivity and even resentment about being an ecclesiastical outlier: e.g. even though a few years earlier he had aspired to be Pope Damasus' successor as bishop of Rome

(cf. *epist.* 45.3.1), he forever remained an essentially non-practicing priest with no measurable influence within the traditional hierarchy of the contemporary church. In any event, whether or not Jer.'s incipient frustration with John's alleged tyrannical behavior did in fact inform this remark in *Epistula* 52, it may be observed that relations between the two did exponentially worsen in the coming year. In the late spring or early summer of 394 John excommunicated Jer. and his monastic community at Bethlehem as part of the opening act of the Origenist controversy in Palestine; see P. Nautin, "L'excommunication de saint Jérôme," *AEHE* V 80/81 (1972–1973): 7–37. This sentence ended up lasting three long years (it was lifted by John on Holy Thursday, April 2 of 397), and its effects were far-reaching. Jer. and his cohorts were barred from entering the Cave and the Church of the Nativity as well as other churches in the diocese of Jerusalem, the priests in his monastery were not allowed to administer the sacraments and indeed it seems that nobody in the community was permitted even to receive the Eucharist. Things went from bad to worse in the early autumn of 395. John obtained from Flavius Rufinus, the powerful praetorian prefect of the east, an official order banishing Jer. and his monks permanently from Palestine. However, Rufinus was assassinated on 27 November of 395, before the order could be carried out.

*sacerdotes* Cyprian had used the term *sacerdos* exclusively for bishops (E.W. Benson, *Cyprian: His Life, his Times, his Work* [London, 1897], 33n3; M. Bévenot, "Sacerdos as understood by Cyprian," *JThS* n.s. 30 [1979]: 413–429 [421–423]); on third-century ecclesiastical nomenclature, see further A. Vilela, *La Condition collégiale de prêtres au III<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1971). During the fourth and fifth centuries the word was applied primarily to bishops but sometimes also to priests; see P.M. Gy, "Remarques sur le vocabulaire antique du sacerdoce chrétien," in *Études sur le sacrement de l'ordre* (Paris, 1957), 125–145 (133–145); P. Mousterde, "Quelques mots de la langue chrétienne," *MUB* 38 (1962): 161–188; M. Poirier, "Évolution du vocabulaire chrétien latin du sacerdoce et du presbytérat des origines à saint Augustin," *BSAF* (1997): 230–245 (243–245); G. Predel, *Vom Presbyter zum Sacerdos: historische und theologische Aspekte der Entwicklung der Leitungsverantwortung und Sacerdotalisierung des Presbyterates im spätantiken Gallien* (Münster, 2005), 174–197. Augustine is an anomaly in that he tended, at least during his debate with the Donatists, to avoid speaking of a priest or bishop as a *sacerdos* because he wanted to uphold the unique priesthood of Christ (D. Zahringer, *Das kirchliche Priestertum nach dem hl. Augustinus* [Paderborn, 1931], 115–119). Ambrose reserved the word almost exclusively for bishops (D. Ramos-

Lissón, “*Referamus ad Christum* comme paradigme aux vierges dans les *Traitées sur la virginité* de saint Ambroise,” *StudPatr* 28 [1993]: 65–74 [72n61]; cf. Gryson, 133–142), as did Pope Innocent I (see PL 20:464, 531). Jer. was the first ecclesiastical writer to use *sacerdos* interchangeably for ‘bishop’ and ‘presbyter’ on a wide scale (E.W. Watson, “The Style and Language of St. Cyprian,” *StudBiblEccl* 4 [1896]: 189–324 [259]).

In the letter to Nepotian *sacerdos* stands for ‘priest’ three times: Jewish (10.2), pagan (6.1), and Christian (7.5), and in this last instance it is synonymous with *presbyter*. In the overwhelming majority of cases, though, it means both *episcopus* and *presbyter* simultaneously (5.2, 6.2, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 11.1, 11.3, 16.1), and likewise, *sacerdotium* covers both the presbyterate and episcopate (5.7 [*bis*], 10.3); when bishops alone are meant, either *episcopus* (6.2, 7.3, 7.5, 9.2) or *pontifex* (4.4, 7.2, 7.3, 9.3, 10.3) is used. In the translation I have rendered the inclusive *sacerdos* as ‘priest’ in view of the sacramental ministry shared by both bishops and presbyters but not by other church functionaries (see on 7.3 *unus ... ministerium*), and so ‘priest’ in the translation is to be understood in this broad sense and not in the specialized one that it has acquired in English. The word *presbyter*, which is more akin to ‘priest’ in the modern sense of the word, is rendered as ‘presbyter’ rather than as ‘priest’.

Jer. favors the inclusive meaning of *sacerdos* because he wishes to impose a strict ascetic code of conduct on not only presbyters like Nepotian but also bishops, the highest-ranking officers in the institutional church; to this same end he frequently employs the open-ended substantive *clericus*, which encompasses all those who have taken holy orders, from lecturers to bishops (see on 1.1 *clericus*). In Jer.’s view both presbyters and bishops share the same sacramental ministry and what differentiates them is the (for him) essentially inconsequential matter of ecclesiastical rank. In the present passage he plays on this ambiguity to emphasize the fundamental sense of solidarity (i.e. the divine priesthood) that *episcopi* should remember they share with *presbyteri* (cf. below *unus dominus, unum templum, unum sit etiam ministerium*, with n.) and therefore should not act like power-mongering despots. Such arrogant behavior is condemned by Jer. also at *comm. in Tit.* 1.5b ll. 283–286 as well as by Gregory of Nazianzus (*orat.* 21. 9 τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν), Julian Pomerius (*v. cont.* 1.13.1; cf. 1.21.3, on how corrupt priests exercise a *dominatio tyrannica* over their spiritual subjects), and Gregory the Great (*reg. past.* 2.6; cf. 1.1, 2.3). Likewise, Origen says that bishops should remember that they are called *non ad principatum ... sed ad servitutem totius ecclesiae* (Ruf. trans. *hom. in vis. Is.* 6 6.1 [PG 13:239]), and Ambrose adds that they should treat their lower clergy

as members of their own body (*off.* 2.134); cf. Gryson, 311–317. Chrysostom extends this ideal to the priest's relations with the members of his congregation: he must act tenderly toward them as if they were his own children (*sacerd.* 5.4) and must not regard himself as a lord over their faith but as their counselor (*hom. in Eph.* 11.5 [PG 62:87]); cf. *Jer. comm. in Tit.* 1.6–7 ll. 400–401 *sciat itaque episcopus et presbyter sibi populum conservum esse, non servum.*

*honorent clericos quasi clericos ut et ipsis a clericis quasi episcopis deferatur* In both of its occurrences in this sentence *quasi* is a synonym for *ut* (= 'as') and should be translated accordingly; for this Hieronymian usage, cf. Goelzer, 430. These 'clergymen' (*clericos ... clericos ... clericis*) obviously do not include bishops, who already are accounted for by *episcopi ... episcopis*, though elsewhere in the letter to Nepotian the word *clericus* is inclusive of bishops as well as lower clergy (see on 1.1 *clericus*).

*scitum illud est oratoris Domitii: "ego te," inquit, "habeam ut principem cum tu me non habeas ut senatorem"* The phrase *scitum est* = 'it is a witty (or shrewd, clever, argute) saying' (see Lewis-Short sv *scisco* III A b). For some representative examples of this idiom when it introduces a maxim, see *Cic. divin.* 2.51 *vetus illud Catonis admodum scitum est, qui mirari se aiebat, quod non rideret haruspex, haruspicem cum vidisset, amic.* 90 *scitum est enim illud Catonis ut multa: melius de quibusdam acerbos inimicos mereri quam eos amicos qui dulces videantur; illos verum saepe dicere, hos numquam; Plin. mai. nat. hist.* 14.148 *scitumque est Scytharum legati, quanto plus biberint, tanto magis sitire Parthos; Jer. epist.* 66.9.2 *scitum est illud Catonis: sat cito, si sat bene, quod nos quondam adulescentuli, cum a praefecto oratore in prae fatiuncula diceretur, risimus.*

Jer. adds yet another layer of classical erudition to his letter by incorporating into his prose a witty saying by the renowned early imperial prosecutor Cn. Domitius Afer (c.10–5 BC – c.60 AD); for his prosopography and oratorical portfolio, see L. Bablitz, *Actors and Audience in the Roman Courtroom* (London, 2007), 152; S. Rutledge, *Imperial Inquisitions* (London, 2001), 220–223. Quintilian, who as an *adulescentulus* had heard Domitius speak in Rome (*inst. orat.* 5.7.7, 10.1.86), ranked him as one of the greatest of all orators (*inst. orat.* 10.1.118; cf. 12.11.3). The saying quoted by Jer. survives only through the letter to Nepotian. It originally was preserved through a book of Domitius' witticisms which was published later in the author's lifetime (cf. *Quint. inst. orat.* 6.3.42; on his famously sententious humor, see further *inst. orat.* 5.10.79, 8.5.3, etc.). It is doubtful that Domitius' compilation was still circu-

lating in the second half of the fourth century, and so Jer. retrieved the *scitum* probably not directly from this work but rather through some literary intermediary.

More than a century ago F. Münzer, “Die Verhandlung über das *Ius honorum* der Gallier im Jahre 48,” in *Festschrift Otto Hirschfeld* (Berlin, 1903), 34–44 (42n2), hypothesized that the statement in question is a bold protest made to the emperor Claudius in 47/8 during the *lectio senatus*; Münzer’s view was later espoused by R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), 328. However, W. McDermott, “Saint Jerome and Domitius Afer,” *VChr* 34 (1980): 19–23, argued persuasively that the quip was uttered not to Claudius but to Caligula, who had held a grudge against Domitius ever since the latter prosecuted Claudia Pulchra, the second cousin of Caligula’s mother Agrippina, in 26 on charges including adultery and treason. According to Dio (59.19.2–7), Caligula brought Domitius before the senate and delivered a lengthy oration against him. Eager to gain the temperamental emperor’s favor so as to avoid possible execution, Domitius effusively praised the rhetorical virtuosity of the speech right then and there and threw himself at his accuser’s feet (Caligula relented, forgave Domitius, and in 39 awarded him a consulship). The statement quoted by Jer. was excerpted from Domitius’ groveling and over-gracious (lost) rebuttal, and as such it should not be interpreted as being hostile or confrontational toward the emperor, yet this is the meaning implied by the question mark supplied by Hilberg. McDermott’s suggestion that we remove this interrogative punctuation as well as construe *habeam* as an optative subjunctive and *cum ... habeas* as a concessive clause (art. cit., 21)—i.e. “I would have you as emperor, even though you would not have me as senator”—is perfectly sensible in view of the supplicatory nature of the speech in which it was embedded. According to this interpretation, Jer.’s ideal priest will be dutifully submissive to his bishop, irregardless of how unfairly the bishop treats him.

*quod Aaron et filios eius, hoc esse episcopum et presbyteros noverimus* In the eastern church Moses was regarded as the OT prototype of the bishop, but Latin patristic authors accorded this honor to Aaron, thereby stressing the priestly and pastoral aspect of the bishop’s authority; cf. Rapp, 131–132; A. Sterk, “On Basil, Moses, and the Model Bishop: The Cappadocian Legacy of Leadership,” *ChH* 67 (1998): 227–253. On the Aaronic typology for priests (and bishops), see e.g. Ambr. *epist. ex. coll.* 14.48–50; Jer. *epist.* 146.2.3; Jul. Pom. *v. cont.* 2.2.1. Isid. *eccl. off.* 2.7.1; cf. R. Gryson, “Les Lévites, figure de sacerdoce véritable, selon saint Ambroise,” *EphThL* 56 (1980): 89–112.

*episcopum* See on 6.2 *episcopi*.

*unus dominus, unum templum, unum sit etiam ministerium* This tricolon is modelled on the Pauline formula *unus dominus, una fides, unum baptisma* (εἷς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα; Eph. 4:5). Jer. retains the essence of Paul's polyptotic anaphora but alters his *fides* to *templum*, thus evoking the Aaronic spiritual lineage to which Christian priests belong (see previous n.); cf. Cyp. *unit. eccl.* 4, who expands on Paul's wording: *unum corpus et unus spiritus, una spes vocationis vestrae, unus dominus, una fides, unum baptisma, unus deus*? By *unum sit etiam ministerium* he means to say that while the bishop may outrank the priest in terms of his position within the ecclesiastical hierarchy, they both are equals as ministers of sacramental grace (cf. above *episcopi sacerdotes se sciant esse, non dominos*, with n.); Chrysostom was of the same opinion (*hom. in 1 Tim.* 11.3 [PG 62:553]), as was Augustine, who believed that "to be a bishop, presbyter, or deacon was to belong to a ministering community, a college of clerics distinct from one another in function and rank but joined together by mutual affection for a single purpose" (A. Holder, "Styles of Clerical Address in the Letters of Augustine," *StudPatr* 33 [1997]: 100–104 [103–104]). Jer. appears to have held this view consistently throughout his literary career; see *comm. in Tit.* 1.5b ll. 253–254, 283–286 *episcopum et presbyterum unum esse, et aliud aetatis, aliud esse nomen officii ... sicut ergo presbyteri sciunt se ex ecclesiae consuetudine ei qui sibi praepositus fuerit esse subiectos, ita episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine quam dispositionis dominicae veritate presbyteris esse maiores et in commune debere ecclesiam regere, epist.* 69.3.4, 146.2.2; cf. Ps.-Jer. *sept. ord. eccl.* 6 (PL 30:157).

#### 7.4

*apostolus Petrus* Jer. identifies the author of the passage about to be quoted, which comes from 1 Peter, as the apostle Peter. Neither the authenticity nor canonicity of this epistle was questioned by Jer. or any of the other Fathers; see C. Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (Edinburgh, 1901), 7–15. Modern biblical scholars, by contrast, are divided over the question of its authorship. For a summary of the contentious debate, see P. Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter* (Grand Rapids, 1994), 3–7.

*recordemur semper* Cf. the similarly solemn injunction at 5.4 *memento semper quod paradisi colonum de possessione sua mulier eiecerit*.

*sacerdotibus* Here *sacerdotes* simultaneously encompasses both presbyters and bishops; see on 7.3 *sacerdotes*.

“*pascite ... coronam*” 1 Pet. 5:2–4. Although the biblical *neque ut dominantes in cleris* (μηδ’ ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων) actually means “not lording it over those allotted to your charge”, Jer., drawing from his etymology of *clerus* as ‘clergyman’ in ch. 5, takes it as “not lording it over clergymen” (I have preserved Jer.’s intended sense in the translation). He evokes the same Petrine phrase at *comm. in Am.* 8.4–6 ll. 103–104 to describe imperious bishops who bully their ecclesiastical subordinates (*perversos doctores ac principes, qui absque timore dei dominantur cleris*). Several years earlier he had quoted the first part of this same passage also as Scriptural proof of the essential equality of bishops and priests (*comm. in Tit.* 1.5b ll. 276–280).

### 7.5

*pessimae consuetudinis est* This expression + inf. is used by Jer. also at *epist.* 54.13.1.

*in quibusdam ecclesiis tacere presbyteros et praesentibus episcopis non loqui* Here *loqui* = ‘to preach’ (cf. Olivar, 503; the verb has this connotation elsewhere in Jer.: see e.g. *comm. in Eccl.* 10.19, *comm. in Gal.* 1.1.11–12 ll. 42–43, *vir. ill.* 61, *epist.* 53.8.2, as well as above at 7.2). To make his complaint utterly clear Jer. adverts to the figure of *disiunctio* (cf. Lausberg, § 739 ff.) in repeating the same operative notion in the two clauses but, for the sake of lexical *variatio*, using different words (*tacere ... non loqui*).

In the churches of Rome (cf. S. de Blaauw, *Cultus et decor* [Delft, 1987], 36) and doubtless in other churches throughout Italy and elsewhere in the West in the late fourth century it was the prevailing custom that priests be forbidden, presumably under any and all circumstances, from preaching in church when a bishop was in attendance. This was the policy of Ambrose in Milan (Gryson, 138), as it was also of the African churches until the 390s. Possidius (v. *Aug.* 5.3) relates that Valerius, the native-Greek-speaking bishop of Hippo Regius, was insecure about his abilities as a homilist due to his imperfect command of spoken Latin and accordingly recruited Augustine, immediately after his ordination to the priesthood at the beginning of Lent in 391, to deliver sermons to the local congregation even in his presence (cf. *Aug. epist.* 29.7). Possidius makes a point of mentioning that Valerius’ move was *contra usum quidem et consuetudinem Africanarum ecclesiarum* and that fellow African bishops were incensed at this breach of long-standing



ecclesiastical polity—in the words of P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* (rev. ed., Berkeley, 2000), 133, his episcopal colleagues were scandalized because “Valerius had infringed on a jealously-guarded privilege of the African hierarchy, that the bishop alone, seated on his raised throne, should expound the Catholic Scriptures”. Valerius defended his decision by appealing to the widespread tolerance of this practice in the eastern churches (*in orientalibus ecclesiis id ex more fieri sciens et certus*). Valerius did end up setting a precedent that was soon followed by other African bishops (Poss. v. *Aug.* 5.5 *et postea currente et volante huiusmodi fama, bono praecedente exemplo, accepta ab episcopis potestate, presbyteri nonnulli coram episcopis populis tractare coeperunt*), notably Aurelius of Carthage (cf. *Aug. epist.* 41.1).

It does in fact seem to have been standard operating procedure with many fourth-century eastern bishops to give permission to their priests to preach while they themselves were present in the assembly, though this license may have been granted only on special occasions. To take three specific examples, Bishop Maximus of Jerusalem allowed his eventual episcopal successor Cyril to preach in Sunday in his presence (cf. *Cyr. Jer. cat.* 10.14), Bishop Flavian of Antioch extended the same privilege to John Chrysostom (cf. *hom. 2 in illud: Vidi dominum* [SChr 277:100]), and Epiphanius, prior to advancing to the episcopate, preached before Eutychius, bishop of Eleutheropolis (*Jer. c. Ioh.* 4). Jer. alludes to the custom in the Jerusalem diocese when, speaking in his capacity as a priest, he assumes, for rhetorical purposes, that a bishop is listening to him preach: *ego ipse qui loquor, et unusquisque de vobis, sive presbyter sive diaconus sive episcopus ...* (*tract. 9 in Marc.* ll. 130–132). According to the scribal notation for his *De nativitate domini*, he delivered this homily on Christmas day *coram episcopo* (CCSL 78:524), i.e. Bishop John of Jerusalem. Furthermore, it was customary for one or more priests to deliver short homilies in succession, followed at last by the bishop’s homily (see *const. apost.* 2.57); for this particular practice in Jerusalem, see *Cyr. Jer. hom. in paralyt.* 20; *Eger. itin.* 25.1, and for its occurrence in Antioch, see W. Mayer and P. Allen, *John Chrysostom* (London, 2000), 23.

Moreover, Jer., undoubtedly influenced by his (by then) nearly eight years of worshipping in churches in the East (mainly the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem), advocated to Nepotian their less stringent custom of allowing priests to preach in the presence of bishops by registering his displeasure with the alternative that was embraced in some (or many?) western churches.

Finally, it may be noted that the custom criticized by Jer. was by no means bound to the fourth century. The Hispano-Roman church of the

early seventh century observed the same practice. Canon 7 of the Second Council of Seville (619) forbade priests from performing a number of sacerdotal activities in the presence of a bishop, including consecrating the Eucharistic elements, giving solemn blessings, and preaching (PL 84:596–597).

*episcopis* See on 6.2 *episcopi*.

*quasi aut inuideant aut non dignentur audire* With the insinuating *quasi* Jer. ascribes sinister motives to the bishops themselves, alleging that they either are envious at the prospect of ‘mere’ priests putting them to shame by invigorating audiences more effectively than they can, or they are so conceited that they refuse, as a matter of principle, to receive Scriptural teaching and moral exhortation from ecclesiastical subordinates. On multiple occasions Chrysostom rails against bishops who are jealous of lower clergy who outperform them on the podium; see *sacerd.* 5.8, *adv. Iud.* 7.6, *hom. in Gen.* 25.6 (PG 53:226), 54.2 (PG 54:472), *Laz.* 6.9 (PG 48:1042), *stat.* 3.7 (PG 49:38). At *comm. in Tit.* 1.8–9 ll. 496–503 Jer. criticizes invidious bishops (and priests) for threatening to excommunicate parishioners whose financial generosity to the community makes theirs look paltry by comparison. Ambrose (*off.* 2.122) accordingly urges bishops not to become spiteful if priests under their charge happen to win acclaim for any holy and reputable reason, just as long as this acclaim leads to the overall glory of the church. Ps.-Jerome (*sept. ord. eccl.* 6 [PL 30:156]) likewise cautions bishops not to envy priests for performing their sacerdotal duties well.

Whatever truth there may be to all of these allegations in the cases of individual bishops, there is a less conspiratorial explanation for the development and perpetuation of the custom. It probably traced its roots back to the early second century, when, with the emergence of the monepiscopate, the bishop was beginning to be regarded as the sole defender of theological orthodoxy for his community (cf. L. Countryman, “The Intellectual Role of the Early Catholic Episcopate,” *ChH* 48 [1979], 261–268) and accordingly had full responsibility for preaching the Word to his congregation (see Olivar, 529–532). This being the case, it is not difficult to comprehend how the very suggestion that a priest take over the liturgy of the Word, especially when his bishop was in the audience, might be perceived as a usurpation of the bishop’s apostolic teaching prerogative. At any rate, we may infer from Jer.’s polemicizing here against bishops who forbid their priests to preach in front of them that Bishop Heliodorus did not observe in his church in Altinum this widely attested western custom (see previous n.); otherwise, one

wonders why Jer. would risk offending his old friend with the inflammatory insinuation *quasi aut inuideant aut non dignentur audire*.

*“et si alii ... pacis”* 1 Cor. 14:30–33a. Jer. rather creatively misapplies this Pauline text in an attempt to give biblical justification for the priest’s right to speak in the assembly when a bishop is present.

*consolentur* For this passive use of the deponent *consolari*, see *TLL* IV ii.481.21 ff.

*gloria patris est filius sapiens* St. Patrick (*conf.* 47) lifted this statement from the letter to Nepotian, altered its word order very slightly (*filius sapiens gloria patris est*), and, like Jer., related it to a specific hierarchical situation to illustrate the sense of pride a bishop (*pater*) should take in his dutiful priest (*filius sapiens*); see Cain 2010d. L. Bieler, “Der Bibeltext des heiligen Patrick,” *Biblica* 28 (1947): 31–58 (39), hypothesized that Patrick’s statement is an amalgamation of three different Vulgate versets: Prov. 10:1a *filius sapiens laetificat patrem*, Prov. 17:6b *gloria filiorum patres eorum*, and Sir. 3:13a *gloria enim hominis ex honore patris sui*. However, in both Patrick and Jer. it is actually a Vetus Latina reading for Prov. 10:1a (a somewhat loose translation of the LXX υἱὸς σοφὸς εὐφραίνει πατέρα). It may furthermore be noted that Jer. and Patrick are the only Latin patristic authors known to have interpreted Prov. 10:1a allegorically as configuring the ideal bishop-priest relationship.

*gaudeat episcopus iudicio suo cum tales Christo elegerit sacerdotes* These *sacerdotes* are presbyters only and not bishops, who are accounted for by the word *episcopus* (see on 7.3 *sacerdotes*).

*Chapter 8*

In the late fourth century preaching was the priest's primary ecclesiastical duty after the administration of the sacraments (Osborne, 157). While Jer. neglects to explore the sacramental dimension of Nepotian's clerical *officia*, perhaps because he was himself unwilling to exercise the sacramental duties of his own priesthood around this time (see *epist.* 51.1.5), he does devote this entire chapter to the priest's conduct in the pulpit. In a nutshell, he exhorts Nepotian to be concerned with being a conscientious purveyor of divine truth rather than with impressing illiterate audiences with bombastic displays of eloquence. He underscores this core prescription by maintaining a strong running antithesis between the ideal of Scriptural expertise to which Nepotian is to aspire (§1 *mysteriorum peritum et sacramentorum dei tui eruditissimum*) and the brashness of clerical declaimers whose sermons lack expository substance (§1 *indoctorum hominum*; §1 *adtrita frons interpretatur saepe quod nescit*; §3 *inperitis contionatoribus*) as well as the ignorance of the unwashed masses whom they deceive (§1 *inperitum vulgum*; §2 *indoctam contionem ... quae quidquid non intelligit plus miratur*; §3 *non didicerunt*). Jer. reinforces his admonitions with an unflattering anecdote about his former Bible teacher Gregory of Nazianzus and a lengthy excerpt from a lost speech by Cicero.

## 8.1

*dicente te dicere* here = 'to preach'; for this meaning, see Olivar, 501–502.

*in ecclesia* It is unknown whether there were churches in Altinum in the late fourth century besides Heliodorus' cathedral church; see S. Greenslade, *Early Latin Theology* (London, 1956), 313n2. I have therefore rendered the phrase *in ecclesia* non-specifically as "in church", as opposed to "in the church", which presupposes that there was only one church in Altinum in which Nepotian was able to preach. I leave aside from this discussion house-churches such as the kind that Chrysostom (*hom. in Act.* 18.4–5 [PG 60:147–148]) exhorts the affluent members of his congregation to build on their expansive properties and equip with their own clerical staff. Chrysostom tells them to invite the poor to worship with them there, and since he speaks of public celebration of the Eucharist it is clear that he is thinking of actual churches and not the sort of private domestic chapels that aristocratic Christians would erect on their estates (on these oratories, see G. Mackie, *Early Christian Chapels in the West* [Toronto, 2003], 61–68).

*non clamor populi sed gemitus suscitetur; lacrimae auditorum laudes tuae sint* Jer. has appropriated phraseology from his *libellus* on virginity to Eustochium, in which he describes the top priority of the Pachomian abbot when he preaches to his monks: *dicentis laus in fletu est audientum* (*epist.* 22.35.3). Elsewhere Jer. says: *ille est ergo doctor ecclesiasticus, qui lacrimas non risum movet* (*comm. in Is.* 3.12 ll. 26–27); cf. *comm. in Eccl.* 9.17 ll. 362–366. Cf. Julian of Pomerius' direction to the homilist to aim not for the applause of his hearers but for their compunction: *non vocibus delectetur populi acclamantis sibi, sed fletibus; nec plausum a populo studeat exspectare, sed gemitum ... lacrimas quas vult a suis auditoribus fundi ipse primitus fundat* (*v. cont.* 1.23); cf. Aug. *epist.* 29.7, *doctr. chr.* 4.24; Greg. Magn. *mor. in Iob* 8.44. Of relevance too is Chrysostom's declaration to his congregation in *hom. in Mt.* 17.7 (PG 57:264): ἐπὴνέσατε τὰ εἰρημένα; ἀλλὰ μοι κρότων οὐ δεῖ, οὐδὲ θορύβων, οὐδὲ ἡχῆς. ἐν βούλωμαι μόνον, μεθ' ἡσυχίας καὶ ἐπιστήμης ἀκούοντας, ποιεῖν τὰ λεγόμενα. τοῦτό μοι κρότος, τοῦτο ἐγκώμιον. ἂν δὲ ἐπαινῆς μὲν τὰ εἰρημένα, μὴ ποιῆς δὲ ἅπερ ἐπαινεῖς, μεῖζων μὲν ἢ κόλασις, πλείων δὲ ἢ κατηγορία, καὶ ἡμῖν αἰσχύνη καὶ γέλως; cf. *In illud: si esur. inim.* 1 (PG 51:172) τί γάρ μοι τῶν ἐπαινῶν ὄφελος, ὅταν ὑμᾶς μὴ θεάσωμαι προκόπτοντας κατ' ἀρετήν; τί δέ μοι βλάβος ἐκ τῆς σιγῆς τῶν ἀκουόντων, ὅταν αὐξομένην ὑμῶν ἴδω τὴν εὐλάβειαν; ἔπαινος γὰρ τοῦ λέγοντος οὐχ ὁ κρότος, ἀλλ' ὁ περὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν ζῆλος τῶν ἀκουόντων· οὐχ ὁ θόρυβος κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἀκροάσεως, ἀλλ' ἡ σπουδὴ ἢ διαπαντὸς τοῦ χρόνου. See further A. Roncoroni, "Su *plausus* e *gemitus* nella predicazione cristiana da Gerolamo a Cesario," *Sileno* 2 (1976): 303–315.

The word *clamor* here collectively denotes applause, cheering, and generally any kind of raucous intervention whereby an audience signals its approbation (I have accordingly rendered it as 'plaudits' to encompass these various meanings simultaneously), and *populus*, the noun by which Jer. customarily refers to the people of the church (J. Adams, *The Populus of Augustine and Jerome* [New Haven, 1971], 74–77; Goelzer, 232), stands for the congregation itself. Audiences in late antique churches were not shy about expressing their feelings about a sermon as it was being delivered. If they felt chastised by the preacher, they might loudly sigh (Aug. *serm.* 151.8) or groan (Aug. *enarr. in Ps.* 127.9), or they might even stomp angrily out of church (Greg. Naz. *orat.* 32.2). The congregants might erupt into applause for any number of reasons: at hearing some rhythmical turn of phrase or verbal fireworks (Aug. *serm.* 96.4), when the preacher quoted a biblical verse familiar to them (Aug. *serm.* 19.4, 163B.5, *tract. in Ioh.* 3.21), or just generally to display their content with the oratorical performance (John Chrys. *hom. 1 in Ioh.* [PG 59:37]). For a catalogue of these and other audience reactions, see Olivar, 786–814, 834–867.

*sermo presbyteri scripturarum lectione conditus sit* An allusion to Col. 4:6a *sermo vester semper in gratia sale sit conditus* (ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἅλατι ἡρτυμένος). There is debate about the precise meaning of Paul's metaphor. It may refer to speech that is not insipid or dull (so J.B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* [London, 1879], 230–231), that lacks rhetorical effectiveness (so B. Witherington, *The Letters to Philemon, the Colossians, and the Ephesians* [Grand Rapids, 2007], 200), or that is morally corrupt (D. Williams, *Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character* [Peabody, 1999], 96). Or, alternatively, it may be related to the rabbinic association of wisdom with salt; cf. W. Nauck, "Salt as a Metaphor in Instruction for Discipleship," *ST* 6 (1952): 165–178.

Jer. quotes the Pauline verset in question four other times. Here he dispenses with the saline component of Paul's culinary metaphor and, in a move that appears unique to him among the Greek and Latin Fathers, replaces it with a new seasoning agent, the words of Scripture (cf. *c. Ioh. 13 lectio toto scripturarum sapore condita*). By *sermo* (λόγος) Paul means conversation or speech. Jer. preserves this word in his allusion to the Pauline passage, but he has a different sense in mind for *sermo*, its technical meaning of 'sermon'. By the late fourth century *sermo* had become the standard word for 'sermon' in Christian Latin (Mohrmann, 2.71; Olivar, 503). Even by the twelfth century it was still the preferred term for 'sermon'; see J. Longère, "Le vocabulaire de la prédication," in *La Lexicographie du latin médiéval et ses rapports avec les recherches actuelles sur la civilisation du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1981), 303–320.

Jer. inculcates that sermons be densely packed with Scriptural language and thus that they be an extension of the biblical text itself, as it were (cf. *Aug. doctr. chr.* 4.5, where a discourse rich in Scriptural citation, in which the Bible is allowed to speak for itself, compensates for the speaker's lack of rhetorical elegance). He gives this recommendation in the context of warning Nepotian against seeking applause through displays of oratorical virtuosity on the ecclesial podium. Chrysostom evokes the same Pauline verse when he proposes his blueprint for the ideal sermon—that it reject oratorical finery and focus on presenting pure teaching that is 'seasoned with salt' (*sacerd.* 5.2). It is possible that we may detect here the influence of Chrysostom's treatise, which Jer. had read prior to composing *Epistula* 52 for Nepotian (see *vir. ill.* 129).

*nolo te declamatorem esse et rabulam garrulumque, sed mysteriorum peritum et sacramentorum dei tui eruditissimum* Both Kunst, 190, and Hagendahl, 194n2, 286, identify Cicero, *Orator* 47 as the most immediate inspiration for

this passage: *non enim declamatorem aliquem de ludo aut rabulam de foro, sed doctissimum et perfectissimum quaerimus*. In favor of this identification are the coincidence of *declamatorem* and *rabulam*, the apparent correspondence between Cicero's *doctissimum* with Jer.'s *peritum* and *eruditissimum*, and each author's proposal of a positive alternative introduced by *sed*. Also of possible relevance is the fact that Cicero's *rabula* comes *de foro*; at 5.4 Jer.'s hypocritical priest is said to haunt the *fora* ... *et plateae ac medicorum tabernae*. N. Adkin, "Cicero's *Orator* and Jerome," *VChr* 51 (1997): 25–39 (26–27), demonstrates that *De oratore* 1.202 also is a valid parallel: *non enim caudicum nescio quem neque [pro]clamatorem aut rabulam hoc sermone nostro conquirimus, sed eum virum qui primum sit eius artis antistes* ... Like the other Ciceronian text, this one shares with Jer.'s passage the word *rabulam* (and perhaps also *declamatorem*; cf. K. Kumaniecki, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 3 [Leipzig, 1995], 78) and the alternative proposal opened by *sed*, and additionally Cicero's hierophantic metaphor (*eius artis antistes*) may anticipate the presbyterial tone and content of Jer.'s letter to Nepotian. Moreover, it seems likely that Jer. is working simultaneously from both passages. It may furthermore be observed that he moves beyond his literary models with the addition of the substantive *garrulus* (he couples it with *rabula* also at *apol. c. Ruf.* 1.15), thereby intensifying his expressed disapproval for vacuous rhetorical sermonizing (at 5.4 he identifies *verbositas* as one of the behavioral traits of clerical charlatans; cf. *c. Helv.* 1, *epist.* 69.9.2).

In the late fourth century rhetorically florid sermons—indeed, ones resembling the speeches of professional orators—were very much in fashion, especially in churches located in major urban centers where there were audiences with enough education and sophistication to appreciate their artistry; cf. H. Hubbel, "John Chrysostom and Rhetoric," *CPh* 19 (1924): 261–276 (262–266); J. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2006), 60–63. Thus Gregory of Nazianzus, in his farewell address prior to his departure from Constantinople, says sarcastically about the Christians of Antioch: οὐ γὰρ ζητοῦσιν ἱερεῖς, ἀλλὰ ῥήτορας (*orat.* 42.24); cf. Jer. *comm. in Gal.* lib. 3, prol. ll. 5–12 *iam enim et in ecclesiis ista quaeruntur: omisssaque apostolicorum simplicitate et puritate verborum quasi ad Athenaeum et ad auditoria convenitur ut plausus circumstantium suscitantur, ut oratio rhetoricae artis fucata mendacio quasi quaedam meretricula procedat in publicum, non tam eruditura populo quam favorem populi quaesitura et in modum psalterii et tibiae dulce canentis sensus demulceat audientium* (see also *comm. in Hiez.* 34.1–31 ll. 257–263); John Chrys. *hom. 30 in Act.* (PG 60:225) πολλὰ πολλοὶ πράττουσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ εἰς μέσον στάντες μακρὸν ἀποτείνειν λόγον· καὶ μὲν κρότων τύχωσι τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους, γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τοῦτο

βασιλείας Ἰσον· ἂν δὲ μετὰ σιγῆς τὸν λόγον καταπαύσῃσι, γεέννης δὴ που μάλλον αὐτοῖς χαλεπωτέρα κατέστη τῆς σιγῆς ἢ ἀθυμία. τοῦτο τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἀνέτρεψεν, ὅτι καὶ ὑμεῖς οὐ ζητεῖτε λόγον ἀκοῦσαι κατανυκτικόν, ἀλλὰ τέρψαι δυνάμενον καὶ τῷ ψόφῳ καὶ τῇ συνθέσει τῶν ῥημάτων, καθάπερ μελωδῶν καὶ κιθαριστῶν ἀκούοντες. Repeated complaints by the preachers themselves (cf. N. Adkin, "A Problem in the Early Church: Noise during Sermon and Lesson," *Mnemosyne* 38 [1985]: 161–163) give the impression that congregations paid less attention to *what* was being said than to *how* it was being said and demanded a good theatrical performance: they cheered those who gave them histrionic eloquence, and jeered those who refused (John Chrys. *sacerd.* 5.5). Jer. adjures Nepotian and his other clerical readers who have received formal training in oratory to eschew a garish homiletical style which the word *declamator* suggests (cf. Olivar, 505) and to concentrate on edifying rather than on entertaining their flocks (cf. above *non clamor populi sed gemitus suscitetur; lacrimae auditorum laudes tuae sint*, with n.). Chrysostom makes the same plea at *sacerd.* 5.1.

Jer.'s own homiletic practice is consistent with his admonition to Nepotian, as we observe from the unrevised stenographic transcripts of more than 100 sermons that he delivered in Bethlehem during the 390s and early 400s; see A. Canellis, "Saint Jérôme prédicateur à propos du *Tractatus in Ps. CXLVII*," in J.-L. Breuil (ed.), *Mélanges offerts à Bernard Jacquinod* (Saint-Étienne, 2006), 63–79; P. Jay, "Jérôme à Bethléem: les *Tractatus in Psalmos*," in Duval, 367–380. In these sermons he adopts a *sermo humilis*, a slightly elevated form of everyday speech which is neither pretentious in its verbal and stylistic ornamentation nor so syntactically unsophisticated and imprecise that it renders the message itself incomprehensible; for Augustine's implementation of the plain style in his sermons, see G. Clark, *The Confessions* (Cambridge, 1993), 70–73; Mohrmann, 1.391–402; cf. Ambrose's recommendation for the style that should be used for sermons: *oratio pura simplex dilucida atque manifesta, plena gravitatis et ponderis, non adjectata elegantia sed non intermissa gratia* (*off.* 1.101; see also Jul. Pom. v. *cont.* 1.23–24). Jer.'s extant sermons are characterized by parataxis and asyndeton; see A.S. Pease, "Notes on St. Jerome's Tractates on the Psalms," *JBL* 26 (1907): 107–131; cf. Olivar, 415–420. The conscious decision on the part of Jer.—who, to judge by the polish of his formal literary works, which he composed by dictation, clearly had the capability of producing oratory of superior quality—to employ a quotidian style, with its conspicuous avoidance of rhetorical showmanship and lavish periodicity, was driven not only by his own vision of the proper form that pulpit oratory should take, which he articulates to Nepotian, but also by practical considerations, namely the desire to be comprehensible to



his generally non-scholarly audience of monks (and Paula's nuns), many of whom were native Greek-speaking Orientals who did not necessarily have a firm grasp of literary Latin (cf. *tract. in Ps. 143* ll. 1–6). On the premium he put on being understood by his audience, see e.g. *tract. in Ps. 86* ll. 119–121 *sic scripserunt apostoli, sic et ipse dominus in evangelia sua locutus est, non ut pauci intellegerent sed ut omnes*; cf. *tract. in Ps. 78* ll. 29–31 *ego vero simpliciter rusticana simplicitate et ecclesiastica ita tibi respondeo: ita enim apostoli responderunt, sic sunt locuti, non verbis rhetoricis et diabolicis*.

The chiasmic pleonasm *peritum mysteriorum et sacramentorum dei tui eruditissimum* counterbalances and indeed outmatches, by its fulsomeness, the preceding sequence *declamatorem ... et rabulam garrulumque*. Hilberg has *mysterii*, which I have emended to *mysteriorum*, the *lectio* found in *K, Σ, D, k*, and *B*, in order to restore the inflexional parallelism with the genitive plural *sacramentorum* and because both words are employed synonymously here (on their interchangeable use, see V. Loi, “Il termine *mysterium* nella letteratura latina cristiana prenicena,” *VChr* 20 [1966]: 25–44). In strictly liturgical contexts both *mysteria* and *sacramenta* usually refer to the Eucharistic sacrifice, e.g. the act of consecration or the divine mystery underlying the ritual itself (cf. Bastiaensen, 82–83; Kasch, 257–258). It is unlikely, however, that Jer. has in mind the liturgical connotation of these words, even though by the late fourth century the priest's primary responsibility had become, in addition to preaching (see Olivar, 532–545), the administration of the sacraments (G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* [King's Lynn, 2005], 270). Not only is Jer., unlike other sacerdotal theorists such as Gregory of Nazianzus (*orat.* 2.95) and John Chrysostom (*sacerd.* 3.4–5), conspicuously unconcerned with the sacramental aspects of the priest's duties (cf. Vogüé, 2.361–362: “L'Épître 52 est donc un écrit purement ascétique, d'où le ministère sacerdotal est à peu près absent”), but also *peritus* and *eruditissimus* seem rather awkward descriptors of the cleric's working knowledge of a rite that in the fourth century was not so complex as to warrant this emphatic doubling of adjectives, one of which is even a superlative. It is much preferable to take *sacramenta* and *mysteria* as referring to the mysteries of Scripture (see on 2.1 *sacramenta*; on *mysterium* and its association with Scripture, see *TLL* VIII 1755.66–74, 1756.7–13, 29–33, 41–45; cf. Jer. *tract. in Ps. 77* l. 152). Indeed, around the time he composed *Epistula* 52 Jer. juxtaposed both words in this sense (*tract. in Ps. 127* ll. 62–64 *videte mysteria scripturarum: videte in verbis simplicibus scripturarum plurima sacramenta*). Nepotian, then, is to be *peritus* and *eruditissimus* in biblical exegesis (in Jer.'s works the adjective *eruditus* habitually is used to describe exegetical prowess; see e.g. *comm. in Hiez.* 9.29 ll. 692–693, *comm. in Eph.* lib. 3 p. 569, *epist.* 18A.9.1, 49.18.2,

85.4.1, *vir. ill.* 57). Moreover, the phrases *mysteriorum peritum* and *sacramentorum dei tui eruditissimum* are pleonastic (I have rendered them as “an exceptionally well-trained expert on the mysteries and arcane things of your God’s Scripture”), and the pleonasm itself is meant to accentuate the importance of the preacher being well-versed in the biblical text. Finally, the present passage looks back to and amplifies *sermo presbyteri scripturarum lectione conditus sit*: Nepotian’s sermons are to be suffused with not only Scriptural references and quotations but also rich exposition that plumbs the deeper meaning of the biblical text. According to Jer. (*epist.* 60.10.8), even Nepotian’s dinnertime conversation was dominated by talk of Scripture.

*verba volvere et celeritate dicendi apud inperitum vulgus admirationem sui facere indoctorum hominum est* Cf. *comm. in Eccl.* 9.17 ll. 362–366 *quemcumque in ecclesia videris clamatorem et cum quodam lenocinio ac venustate verborum excitare plausus, risum excutere, audientes in affectus laetitiae concitare; scito signum esse insipientiae, tam eius qui loquitur quam eorum qui audiunt*. At *Orator* 53 Cicero acknowledges that *flumen aliis verborum volubilitasque cordi est, qui ponunt in orationis celeritate eloquentiam* (Kunst, 190, probably rightly sees in this Ciceronian text the inspiration for the present passage in Jer.), and at *Brut.* 246 he identifies the prosecutor Marcus Pontidius as an orator who exemplified this oratorical school of thought (*M. Pontidius municeps noster multas privatas causas actitavit, celeriter sane verba volvens* ...). Jer. here condemns Christian preachers who adopt a rapid-fire style of delivery in order to overwhelm and thereby impress simple audiences (here called *inperitum vulgus* and in the next section *vilis plebicula* and *indocta contio*) who are unable to keep up with the pace of their oratory. At *comm. in Am.* 8.4–6 ll. 10–11 he speaks disapprovingly of bombastic preachers who are longwinded.

For the alliterative locution *verba volvere* (= ‘to reel off words’; *OLD* sv *volvo* 10), see Cic. *Brut.* 246 (cited above), Jer. *apol. c. Ruf.* 1.26. At *epist.* 108.18.6 Jer. uses this expression in a positive sense when praising Paula’s habit of adverting to Scriptural quotation in times of trouble (*in temptationibus Deuteronomii verbaolvebat*).

*adtrita frons interpretatur saepe quod nescit et cum aliis suaserit sibi quoque usurpat scientiam* I.e. the insolent preacher puts on airs and pretends to be an expert, and by projecting self-confidence he manages to win over the ignorant, and he in turn takes this popular approbation as an affirmation to himself that he knows whereof he speaks, though in reality he is a windbag

who deludes not only the masses but also himself. Cf. *comm. in Hiez.* 11.34.1–31 ll. 259–262, *comm. in Eph.* lib. 2 p. 525 *nonnulli rugata fronte, demisso supercilio, verbisque trutinatis, auctoritatem sibi doctorum et iudicum vindicant. non quo ipsi dignum aliquid arrogantia noverint: sed quo simplices quosque fratrum sui quaedam videant comparatione nescire*, *epist.* 69.9.2. Gregory of Nazianzus likewise opens his twentieth oration by denouncing the longwindedness of contemporary homilists who pride themselves on their illusory wisdom: ὅταν ἴδω τὴν νῦν γλωσσαλγίαν, καὶ τοὺς αὐθημερινούς σοφοὺς, καὶ τοὺς χειροτονητοὺς θεολόγους, οἷς ἀρκεῖ τὸ θελῆσαι μόνον πρὸς τὸ εἶναι σοφοῖς.

At 5.4 Jer. applied the phrase *adtrita frons* to the secularized clergyman who brazenly rejects the monastic lifestyle, and now he invokes it again to caricature his effrontery as a preacher, specifically his pretense of being an expert on the Bible and beguiling his unsuspecting audience with ostensibly authoritative but actually false explanations of the Scriptural text (that *interpretari* here has this technical meaning of expounding Scripture is confirmed by the anecdote about Gregory of Nazianzus that Jer. offers as a concrete illustration of his point).

The expression [*sibi*] *usurpare scientiam* is evidently late; it occurs once in Ambrose (*exp. Ps.* 118 19.44) and three other times in Jer. (thrive at *dial. c. Pel.* 1.30).

## 8.2

*praeceptor quondam meus Gregorius Nazanzenus* Jer. calls Gregory *praeceptor meus* also at *adv. Iov.* 1.13 and *vir. ill.* 117 (he applies the same epithet to the grammarian Donatus: *comm. in Eccl.* 1.9–10, *chron.* a.354, *apol. c. Ruf.* 1.16). He introduces his anecdote by boastfully naming Gregory of Nazianzus as his former Scriptural tutor, but he proceeds to cast him in a negative light as an applause-seeking preacher, he simultaneously distances himself somewhat from his former *praeceptor* with the hyperbatic adverb *quondam* which functions as an adjective (i.e. ‘former’; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, 171; Skahill, 59). Be that as it may, this is a fine illustration of his notorious penchant for publicizing his association with famous ecclesiastical contemporaries (see e.g. *vir. ill.* 109 [Didymus], 125 [Evagrius; cf. S. Rebenich, “Hieronymus und Evagrius von Antiochia,” *StudPatr* 28 (1993): 75–80], 128 [Gregory of Nyssa], 132 [Flavius Dexter], 133 [Amphilochius of Iconium]; cf. Cain 2009a, 43–48 [Pope Damasus]). Rufinus sneered at Jer.’s name-dropping tendencies: *cetera Graecorum auctorum nomina, ut doctus videatur et plurimae lectionis, tamquam fumos et nebulas lectoribus spargit* (*apol. c. Hier.* 2.7). In con-

nection with Jer.'s naming of Gregory in the letter to Nepotian, S. Rebenich, "Asceticism, Orthodoxy, and Patronage: Jerome in Constantinople," *StudPatr* 33 (1997): 358–377 (364), notes: 'In his later writings, Jerome, depicting himself as Gregory's pupil, made much of the *auctoritas* of the learned and, we may add, orthodox Cappadocian Father in the hope of reducing the critics of his scholarship and orthodoxy to silence'. Gregory had even more cachet in the Latin-speaking West than he otherwise would have had due to Jer.'s name-dropping and of course also to Rufinus' translation (399/400) of nine of his orations into Latin (they are collected in CSEL 46); cf. F.X. Murphy, "Rufinus of Aquileia and Gregory the Theologian," *GOTR* 39 (1994): 181–186. On Gregory's continually growing reputation in the West after this point, see C. Simelidis, *Selected Poems of Gregory of Nazianzus* (Göttingen, 2009), 59–60.

Although Jer. does not expressly say so, the setting for the anecdote that he recounts was Constantinople. It is possible to establish a relatively precise chronological window within which the reported conversation with Gregory must have taken place. Jer. arrived in Constantinople probably shortly after 24 November 380, the date of Theodosius' entry into the city (see Rebenich 1992, 118–119), and he remained there until the summer of 382 (Kelly, 80). Of the many factors that may have made the eastern capital an attractive destination for him, the desire to study under Gregory has reasonably been suggested as an important motivation (Kelly, 66). Gregory had arrived a year earlier, in the autumn of 379 (for the dating, see B. Daley, *Gregory of Nazianzus* [London, 2006], 14–15), and he departed thence for good in late June of 381 (McGuckin, 366). Thus, the two men's stays in Constantinople overlapped presumably from December of 380 until late June of the next year. While the conversation conceivably took place at any point within this approximately six-month window, we might slightly favor the first half due to Gregory's intensive involvement in the Council of Constantinople which opened in May (Socr. *hist. eccl.* 1.5.8) and ended on 9 July 381, after Gregory had already left for his native Cappadocia; his conciliar activities may have left him with little time to spare for Scriptural tutorials with hyper-inquisitive students like Jer.

In addition to the present passage Jer. gives us brief, tantalizing glimpses into his Scriptural studies under the Cappadocian Father also at *comm. in Is.* 6.1 ll. 15–18 (*cum essem Constantinopoli et apud ... Gregorium Nazianzenum ... sanctarum scripturarum studiis erudirer*), *comm. in Eph.* lib. 3 p. 569 (*cum de hoc me cum tractaret loco ...*; cf. J.-M. Matthieu, "Grégoire de Nazianze et Jérôme: commentaire de l'*In Ephesios* 3,5,32," in Duval, 115–127), *vir. ill.* 117 (*quo scripturas explanante didici*), and *epist.* 50.1.3 (*Gregorium Nazanzenum*

*et Didymum in scripturis sanctis καθηγητάς habui*). For some of Gregory's possible influences on Jer.'s thought, see e.g. B. Jeanjean, "Une exégèse antiarienne de Grégoire de Nazianze dans la lettre 55 de Jérôme," in J.-M. Poinssotte (ed.), *Les chrétiens face à leurs adversaires dans l'Occident latin du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Mont-Saint-Aignan, 2001), 195–210; C. Moreschini, *Filosofia e letteratura in Gregorio di Nazianzo* (Milan, 1997), 150–161.

*δευτερόπρωτον* The adjective *δευτεροπρώτος* (lit. "second-first") is found in many western and Byzantine MS authorities for Lk. 6:1 as an adjectival modifier of *σάββατον* (ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ). It is a *vox nulla* that most modern biblical commentators take to be the accidental result of a transcriptional blunder. For instance, B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London, 1971), 139, hypothesizes that it is a combination of scribal glosses: *πρώτῳ* originally had been inserted to contrast with *ἐτέρῳ* in Lk. 6:6, a second scribe crossed it out, placing dots over the letter, and inserted *δευτέρῳ* on account of Lk. 4:31, and a third scribe, not noticing the dots signifying the deletion of *πρώτῳ*, mistakenly combined the two glosses into one. This reading is preserved by numerous Greek and Latin (as in *sabbato secundoprmo*) patristic authors' quotations of Lk. 6:1. This is the only time that the word appears in Jer.'s extant works, and thus it appears not to have attracted comment from him after his conversation with Gregory of Nazianzus. In fact, among Jer.'s patristic contemporaries and predecessors, Chrysostom (*hom. in Mt.* 39.1 [PG 57:433]) and Ambrose (*expl. Ps.* 47 1.3–4) are the only ones on record to have attempted explanations of this nonsensical word.

*eleganter lusit* Jer. used this same expression later at *epist.* 127.2.2 to introduce an epigrammatic retort by Marcella, who rebuffs her elderly suitor Naeratus Cerealis: *illoque mandante posse et senes diu vivere et iuvenes cito mori eleganter lusit*: "*iuvenis quidem potest cito mori, sed senex diu vivere non potest*". Jer. nudges the reader to interpret Gregory's reply to him as a piece of self-indulgent wit, though one of which he is not particularly approving: while *eleganter* is complimentary in the anecdote about Marcella (e.g. "cleverly"), it has a more sinister sense in Gregory's case (e.g. "craftily"); on this latter connotation of the word, see *TLL* V 2 iii.336.1ff. Gregory's appreciation of jocular repartee and his at times even mischievous sense of humor is well known (see McGuckin, 93–94, 226, 247, 283, 292) and can be observed most readily in his personal correspondence (e.g. *epist.* 4.13, 5.1, 6.1, 51.5) and occasionally even in solemn theological contexts (see R. van Dam, *Becoming Christian: The Conversion of Roman Cappadocia* [Philadel-

phia, 2003], 12). It is this lighthearted side of Gregory that emerges from Jer.'s anecdote as he evades his student's question because he does not know the answer.

*"docebo ... condemnaberis"* Jer. reports Gregory's words in Latin, but the conversation from which it has been excerpted would of course have been conducted in Greek. Gregory, after all, knew virtually no Latin (see B. Wyss, "Gregor von Nazianz: ein griechisch-christlicher Dichter des 4. Jahrhunderts," *MusHelv* 6 [1949]: 177–210 [205–206]); on the general ignorance of Latin among Greek churchmen during this period, see G. Bardy, *La question des langues dans l'église ancienne* (Paris, 1948), 123–154; B. Rochette, *Le latin dans le monde grec* (Brussels, 1997), 150–154, 251–253. By the time of his arrival in Constantinople in late 380, Jer. had indeed acquired sufficient fluency in Greek to be able to carry on just such a conversation with Gregory; cf. P. Hamblenne, "L'apprentissage du grec par Jérôme: quelques ajustements," *REAug* 40 (1994): 353–364 (362–363).

Jer. briefly acknowledges Gregory's jesting tone (*lusit*), but nevertheless, as he reflects upon the incident nearly fifteen years after the fact, he takes the joke too seriously (as he may have done back in 381 as well), as if Gregory had unwittingly divulged a fundamental character flaw, i.e. his oratorical vanity. Not that he necessarily was unjustified in such an interpretation of the jest, for Gregory was a notoriously self-assured as an ecclesiastical orator; H.-G. Beck, *Rede als Kunstwerk und Bekenntnis* (Munich, 1977), 18–19 (with primary-source references at n. 44); cf. Olivar, 92–93. He also was capable of displays of feigned self-depreciation about the quality of his public speaking (see e.g. *orat.* 36.1; cf. *orat.* 24.3, where he says that he has long since abandoned love for applause); on his rhetorical training and prowess more generally, see Č. Milovanović, "Sailing to Sophistopolis: Gregory of Nazianzus and Greek Declamation," *J ECS* 13 (2005): 187–232; R. Ruether, *Gregory of Nazianzus: Rhetor and Philosopher* (Oxford, 1969), 55–128. Jer. presents his former *praeceptor* as being preoccupied with garnering applause from his congregation, at the expense of providing them with philologically informed expository preaching of the Bible. It seems however that Jer. missed the subtle irony of the joke. Previous commentators have failed to consider the possibility that Gregory is not so much trumpeting his own ability to elicit applause as he is cynically making light of the imperial church custom, established after his own installation in the Church of the Holy Apostles, to have claue-leaders cue the congregation at regular intervals to applaud the bishop as he spoke (on this practice, see McGuckin, 349). Additionally, the suggestion has not yet been made that Gregory may also

have been goodheartedly poking fun at the prudish philologist Jer.'s question about an extremely obscure text-critical problem, which to him probably seemed rather pedantic and insignificant in the grand theological scheme of things—certainly, at any rate, by comparison with the nuances of Trinitarian doctrine with which he wrestled during his time in Constantinople (cf. C. Beeley, *Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God* [Oxford, 2008], 34–54).

P. Gallay, *La vie de S. Grégoire de Nazianze* (Lyon, 1943), 179–181, argued that it was not at all Jer.'s intent to cast Gregory in a negative light. However, his argument hinges upon flawed logic and a fundamental misconstrual of certain points in the Latin text; cf. N. Adkin, "Gregory of Nazianzus and Jerome: Some Remarks," in M. Flower and M. Toher (eds.), *Georgica* (London, 1991), 13–24 (19–20).

*cogeris invitus scire quod nescis* In rendering Gregory's words for a Latin-reading audience Jer. has coupled *cogere* and *invitus*, a collocation found elsewhere in Latin literature (e.g. Caes. *bell. civ.* 3.112.9; Ov. *met.* 11.787; Cic. *Mur.* 42; Jer. *epist.* 69.5.7, 117.6.3; for the juxtaposition of *invitus* and the participial form *coactus*, see e.g. Ter. *Phorm.* 214; Liv. *a.u.c.* 34.11.7, 39.37.19; Caes. *bell. civ.* 1.2.6; Lact. *inst. div.* 5.13.8; Aug. *c. Don.* 11.15). Ambrose, by contrast with Gregory, calls for sermons which make audiences *willing* participants; see *epist.* 7.36.5 *sint ergo sermones tui proflui, sint puri et dilucidi, ut morali disputatione suavitatem infundas populorum auribus et gratia verborum tuorum plebem demulceas, ut volens quo ducis sequatur*.

*si solus tacueris, solus ab omnibus stultitiae condemnaberis* Depending upon the circumstances, applause during a sermon could be a sign that the audience understood a preacher's point, and likewise if some failed to applaud, it could be taken to mean that they failed to grasp the point at hand. Thus Aug. *serm.* 335A.2 *qui adclamastis, intellexistis: sed propter eos, qui non intellexerunt, patimini me, qui intellexistis, paulisper aperire quod dixi* (cf. *serm.* 52.20, 101.9, 163B.5, 164.3).

*nihil tam facile quam vilem plebiculam et indoctam contionem linguae volubilitate decipere* Cf. *comm. in Eccl.* 9.11 ll. 274–279 *videas enim in ecclesia imperitissimos quosque florere; et quia nutrierunt frontis audaciam et volubilitatem linguae consecuti sunt, dum non recogitant quid loquantur, prudentes se et eruditos arbitrantur, maxime si favorem vulgi habuerint, qui magis dictis levioribus delectatur et commovetur; see also Aug. *doctr. christ.* 4.5 *qui vero affluit insipienti eloquentia, tanto magis cavendus est, quanto magis ab eo in**

*his, quae audire inutile est, delectatur auditor et eum, quoniam diserte dicere audit, etiam vere dicere existimat*; Jul. Pom. v. cont. 1.24.

The pleonasm *vilem plebiculam et indoctam contionem*, which I have rendered as “the illiterate rabble”, lends vigor and emphasis to Jer.’s point. The collocation *vilis plebicula* (alt. *plebecula*) is attested only in Jer., who employs it on four other occasions to refer to first-century commoners who believed in Jesus’ message (*comm. in Mt.* 21.10 l. 1280), and, as in the present passage, to the unwashed masses in the church (*comm. in Hier.* 3.15.3 ll. 1–2, *comm. in Gal.* lib. 3, prol. ll. 53–54, *epist.* 121.10.21). The phrase *indocta contio* is unique to Jer.; at *epist.* 53.10.1 he uses the synonymous *rustica contio* for “illiterate congregation”. As a possible inspiration for Jer.’s *linguae volubilitate* Kunst, 190, suggests Cic. *Planc.* 62 (*linguae volubilitas*) and *Brut.* 246 (quoted above; see on 8.2 *verba ... est*). On the gullibility of the Christian masses and their susceptibility to persuasion by deceptive rhetoric, see J. Maxwell, “The Attitudes of Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus toward Uneducated Christians,” *StudPatr* 47 (2010): 117–122.

*quidquid non intellegit plus miratur* Several years later Jer. reproduced this arresting phraseology when describing how heretics deceive the ignorant: *barbaro simplices quosque terrentes sono, ut quod non intellegunt plus mirentur* (*epist.* 75.3.1).

### 8.3

*“Demosthenes tibi praeripuit, ne esses primus orator, tu illi, ne solus”* Jer.’s source for this quip, which ostentatiously serves as yet another classicizing garnish to his prose, is unknown; Kunst, 165n4, suggests that it is a lost *Vita Ciceronis*. In antiquity Demosthenes and Cicero very frequently were cited as the pinnacles of Greek and Latin eloquence; see e.g. Ps.-Long. 12.3–5; Juv. *sat.* 10.114; Quint. *inst. orat.* 10.1.39, 12.1.22; Jer. *epist.* 29.1.3, 49.13.3, 84.6.1, 130.6.1, 147.5.1; Paul. Nol. *epist.* 16.6; Sid. *epist.* 8.2.2; Cassiod. *inst. div.*, praef. 4.

The same sentiment is captured, in a Christian context, by Gregory of Nazianzus: τίς οὐκ οἶδε τὸν τούτου πατέρα, Βασίλειον, τὸ μέγα παρὰ πᾶσιν ὄνομα, ὃς πατρικῆς εὐχῆς ἔτυχεν, ἵνα μὴ λέγω μόνος, εἴπερ τις ἀνθρώπων; παντὸς γὰρ κρατῶν ἀρετῇ, παρὰ τοῦ παιδὸς κωλύεται μόνου τὸ πρωτεῖον ἔχειν (*orat.* 43.10). In another funeral oration, on his brother Caesarius (*orat.* 7.4), Gregory says that his parents Gregory the Elder and Nonna vie with each other for first place in virtuousness but each keeps the other from attaining it (he says much the same thing about his parents in the funeral oration on his sister Gorgonia; see *orat.* 8.5).



*in oratione pro Quinto Gallio* The *novus homo* Q. Gallius was plebeian aedile in 67, and a year later he campaigned for and won the praetorship. During the campaign he had sponsored a gladiatorial show, ostensibly offering it as a *munus* to his father, and as a result was accused of electoral bribery (*ambitus*). In 64, after he had successfully completed his term, this accusation was renewed, formal charges were brought, and Gallius was put on trial. He was defended by Cicero and prosecuted by the noted orator M. Calidius. For the fragments of Cicero's speech (with commentary), see J. Crawford, *M. Tullius Cicero: The Fragmentary Speeches* (Atlanta, 1994), 149–151, and for the two surviving fragments of Calidius' oration, see E. Malcovati, *Oratorum romanorum fragmenta* (4th ed., Turin, 1976), 435–436. Although the outcome of the trial is unknown, there is reason to believe that Gallius was convicted; see J. Ramsey, "A Reconstruction of Q. Gallius' Trial for *ambitus*: One Less Reason for Doubting the Authenticity of the *Commentariolum Petitionis*," *Historia* 29 (1980): 402–421 (417). Even though Cicero evidently lost, his speech was popular and widely read in antiquity (Crawford, 148). It survives in ten fragments, one of which is the lengthy excerpt preserved solely by Jer., who presumably had access to a copy of the entire work and did not simply retrieve the quoted portion from a literary intermediary. The critical text was established by Hilberg during the course of his preparation of the CSEL volumes of Jer.'s correspondence; see his "Ein verkanntes Bruchstück von Ciceros Rede pro Q. Gallio," *WS* 27 (1905): 93–94.

*contionatoribus* Jer.'s usage here of the relatively uncommon word *contionator* (cf. *TLL* IV iv.734.48 ff.) presumably was influenced by his choice of the paronomasic *contio* in the preceding section (*indoctam contionem*), a noun he employs nearly a dozen other times. At *comm. in Am.* 8.4–6 ll. 10–11 he uses this word to denigrate longwinded preachers (*in modum contionatorum loquantur sermone longissimo*).

*"his autem ludis ... didicerunt"* In this fragment Cicero attacks a *homo perlitteratus*, an unnamed contemporary mimic poet who may have been either Publilius Syrus (E. Hauler, "Die in Ciceros Galliana erwähnten convivia poetarum ac philosophorum und ihr Verfasser," *WS* 27 [1905]: 95–105) or Decimus Laberius (F. Giancotti, *Mimo e gnome: studio su Decimo Laberio e Publilio Siro* [Firenze, 1967], 119–128). Whoever he in fact was, he wrote plays that depicted banquets attended by famous philosophers and poets whose lives had never come close to intersecting chronologically. Cicero ridicules not only the anachronistic absurdity of this all but also the gullibility of theater-goers who thunderously applaud such nonsense and apparently do

not recognize these scenarios for the fictions they are. Likewise, Jer. derides insipient clerical blowhards together with their naive audiences who are led astray by vacuous eloquence.

*homo perlitteratus* *homo litteratus* is an appellation employed on several occasions by Cicero (*Verr.* 2.1.92; *Arch.* 3; *Mur.* 16; *Scaur.* 23; *Brut.* 100; *de orat.* 3.225), but the adjective *perlitteratus* appears to be a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον. Since Cicero proceeds to lampoon this unnamed playwright for being unlettered just like his audience, the epithet *perlitteratus* is ironic, and the prefix *per-*, of which Cicero was rather fond (see A. Dyck, *A Commentary on Cicero, De Legibus* [Ann Arbor, 2004], 40), actually imparts a mocking sense to *litteratus*.

## Chapter 9

This chapter contains guidelines for the monastic priest's manner of dress, a denunciation of greedy clerical almoners who solicit money from rich donors ostensibly for the poor but really in order to enrich themselves, and a proscription against 'sinful eloquence' that looks back to the previous chapter.

## 9.1

*vestes pullas aequae vita ut candidas* Caesarius of Arles (*stat. virg.* 44) similarly enjoined his nuns: *omnia vero indumenta simplici tantum et honesto colore habeant, numquam nigra, numquam lucida*. Jer. generally approves of dark-colored clothing for ascetics because it symbolizes a penitential mindset (*epist.* 24.3.2, 38.3.1, 38.4.3, 66.6.1, 66.13.1, 117.6.2, 128.2.1), though it is worn by monastic impostors at *epist.* 22.27.7, 79.2.4, 117.7.2, 125.6.3. He associates shining-white garb with the sleek senatorial outfits of the day; e.g. the aristocratic ascetic Salvina exchanged her *candida vestis* for a *pulla tunica* (*epist.* 79.7.7). His point is that Nepotian should dress in such a way as neither to be too conspicuous about his monastic piety (*vestes pullas*) nor to give rise to suspicion that he is living in luxury and perhaps using his clerical office to enrich his personal financial situation (*vestes candidas*). Along these lines Chrysostom (*hom. in Php.* 9.4 [PG 62:251]) reports that some affluent Christian benefactors become agitated if they see their priest dressing in clothing whiter (λαμρότερον ἱμάτιον) than they normally wear (he mentions the clergy's white clothing also at *hom. in Mt.* 72.6 [PG 58:745]) because they interpret this as a sign that he is living too comfortably. Clement, however, maintains that the Christian wardrobe should include only clothing that is white and not multi-colored, for the latter suggests luxuriousness and fashion-consciousness (*paed.* 3.11.53.3–4). It may furthermore be pointed out that Jer. is not alluding to any kind of formal ecclesiastical uniform, for the clergy did not begin to wear distinctive garb outside the liturgical context of the church until the fifth century (see Osborne, 146); cf. Pope Celestine I, *epist.* 4.1.2 (PL 50:431).

*ornatus et sordes pari modo fugiendae quia alterum delicias, alterum gloriam redolet* Cf. *epist.* 22.29.1 *nec affectatae sordes nec exquisitae munditiae conveniunt Christianis* (see also *epist.* 22.27.3, 58.6.3; cf. Aug. *epist.* 211.13); however, at *epist.* 125.7.1 Jer. states that rags (*sordes vestium*) are appropriate for a monk because they are indicative of a pure mind (cf. Bas. *epist.* 2.6;

Paul. Nol. *carm.* 16.295–296 *mendici tegmine Felix / sorduit, exornans inculto corpore mentem*). For their rejection of ostentatious dress Jer. commends Lea (*epist.* 23.2.2), Asella (*epist.* 24.5.2), Blesilla (*epist.* 39.1.3), and Nepotian (*epist.* 60.10.2 *cultus ipse provinciae morem sequens nec munditiis nec sordibus notabilis erat*). He satirically portrays Jovinian as violating this mean because he once was a grungily-clad monk but now he is a fashion-conscious dandy, and Jer. says that both extremes are sinful (*adv. Iov.* 2.21). Augustine is said to have exemplified sartorial moderation: *vestes eius et calciamenta vel lectualia ex moderato et competenti habitu erant, nec nitida nimium nec abiecta plurimum; quia his plerumque vel iactare se insolenter homines solent vel abicere* (Poss. v. *Aug.* 22.1); on Cyprian's modest attire, see Pont. v. *Cyp.* 6.3, and on Basil's, see Greg. Naz. *orat.* 18.23, 43.60. Ambrose (*off.* 1.83) stipulates that priests not dress in a flashy way; both Basil (*epist.* 22.2) and Cassian (*inst.* 1.2) make the same requirement of monks. Over-attentiveness to one's garb and general personal appearance is addressed in numerous late antique and early medieval monastic rules, e.g. Bas. *reg. fus.* 22; *Aug. praec.* 4.1; *Caes. stat. virg.* 22; *Ps.-Fructuos. Brag. reg. mon.* 11; cf. *Ps.-Athanas. virg.* 3–4; *Jer. epist.* 108.20.5. Cassian (*inst.* 11.3) notes more generally that the vice of vainglory (*inanis gloria*) tries to undermine the soldier of Christ in, among other things, his manner of dress.

*non absque amictu lineo incedere, sed pretium vestium linearum non habere, laudabile est* Jer. again (cf. e.g. 5:4 and 6:2) advocates monastic poverty for the cleric, this time framing his exhortation in a sartorial context, beautifying his prose, and reinforcing the brunt of his precept, with homoioteleuton (-ere ... -ere), parechesis (*pretium vestium*), alliteration, polyptotic *disiunctio* (*amictu lineo ... vestium linearum*), and negative-positive arsis-thesis. He associates linen clothing with opulence also at *epist.* 77.5.2, 108.15.4, 128.2.1, *adv. Iov.* 2.21; hence the voluptuary deacon Sabinian is said to be decked out in linen garb (*epist.* 147.8.2). Linen, after wool, was the garment fabric used most often by the Romans beginning in the late Republic. Cheap, low-quality linen, whether manufactured in Italy or imported from places as far away as Antioch (see J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, *Antioch* [Oxford, 1972], 60), was available to Italian consumers in the late Roman period, but it was the costly, higher-end foreign linen (such as that imported from Egypt) from which designer clothing was fabricated, that attracts Jer.'s comment here. His stipulation assumes special significance in view of the fact that during the late imperial period Nepotian's native Altinum was known for being a minor center for the production of woollen clothing (see P. Garnsey, *Peasants and Food in Classical Antiquity* [Cambridge, 1998], 47).

*ridiculum et plenum dedecoris referto marsuppio* Jer. is extremely fond of this antithesis between the pretense of poverty and a full money-purse. See *comm. in Is.* 9.14 l. 38 *praeferens paupertatem et replens marsuppium*, *comm. in Hiez.* lib. 8, prol. ll. 15–16 *paupertatem vili palliolo praeferentes, Croesi opibus incubare*, *comm. in Mich.* 3.9–12 ll. 296–298 *quid iuvat esse μονοχίτωνας, et praeferre habitu paupertatem, cum marsuppium nostrum universa pauperum turba suspiret?*, *epist.* 22.32.1 *plenis arcis pannos trahit*, 58.2.1 *nec pleno marsuppio gloriosas sordes adpetis*, 58.2.2 *possessionum redditibus abundare et vile iactare palliolum*, 125.16.4 *pannis aurum tegimus*, 127.4.3 *qui Croesi divitiis tumet vilique opertus palliolo pugnat contra tineas vestium sericarum*. In his rebuke of a lapsed monk Basil expresses the same contrast: ὁ ἐπὶ ἀκτημοσύνῃ σεμνυνόμενος, συλοχρηματῶν ἐφευρίσκη (*epist.* 44.1).

*ridiculum et plenum dedecoris* This pleonasm highlights the ludicrousness of the worldly clergyman's hypocrisy. For some other instances of the common expression *plenus dedecoris*, see *Cic. Pis.* 33, 97, *rep.* 1.51, *epist. ad Att.* 16.7.4.

*marsuppium* *marsuppium* (μαρσύπιον), initially a conventional comic term for 'money-bag', appears fifteen times in Plautus and twice in Varro, but it does not seem to be attested at all in post-Republican Latin literature until the late fourth century. By then it apparently was an archaism that was revived and (re-)entered literary usage. Jer., more so than any other late Latin author, was partial to this word, using it twenty-one times (this includes its two occurrences in the Vulgate: *Gen.* 43:22; *Prov.* 1:14). Other contemporary writers known to have employed it are Prudentius (*psych.* 600, *perist.* 2.104), John Cassian (*coll.* 24.13), Julian of Eclanum (*tract. in Am.* 2.8), and Salvian (*gub. dei* 1.2.10).

*sudarium* Jer. used the plural diminutive of this word above at 5.7 to describe one kind of amatory gift exchanged between licentious clergymen and monks and their female love interests.

## 9.2

*sunt qui* In *qui* clauses dependent on *esse* that express the idea of existence Cicero appears to have been the first Latin author to use the subjunctive mood (cf. Fischer, 552). Jer. decidedly favors the subjunctive in this construction (see e.g. *quaest. hebr. in Gen.* p. 57 Lagarde, *comm. in Is.* 1.2.9 l. 7, *epist.* 119.10.1, 120.12.10), but here he puts the verb into the indicative (*tribuunt*),

and the MSS collated by Hilberg do not present the possibility of the subjunctive and thus do not reasonably allow for an emendation to *tribuant*. In general, the subjunctive, due to its perspicuity (i.e. “there are those who give”), is slightly preferable to the indicative, whose meaning technically is ambiguous (i.e. either “there are those who give” or “they who give exist”).

*pauperibus parum tribuunt ut amplius accipiant* Jer. uses alliteration here to achieve a vivid satiric contrast (cf. Wiesen, 80). He is describing clergymen who canvass wealthy Christians for monetary donations ostensibly on behalf of the poor yet keep most of these gifts for themselves. He advises Paulinus to avoid Judases like these men and distribute his alms with his own hand (*epist.* 58.6.2). Jer. was not alone in his concern about greedy clergymen using alms-collection as a money-making ruse. John Chrysostom certainly was aware of the problem (see *hom. in Hebr.* 11.4 [PG 63:96]; cf. *Pall. dial.* 12), and when benefactors in his congregation in Antioch refused to give money to priests because they suspected that they would abscond with it instead of relaying it to the needy, he proposed a solution: give directly to the poor and thereby eliminate the clerical intermediary (*hom. in 1 Cor.* 21.6 [PG 61:179]). Elsewhere he emphasizes that the clerical almoner should not under any circumstances squander church funds intended for the poor (*hom. in Mt.* 77.4 [PG 58:707]), and Ambrose makes the similar point that the priest exercise the utmost discretion in his stewardship of property bequeathed to the church by wealthy widows (*off.* 2.144). Julian Pomerius likewise stipulates that the priest appointed as almoner have a reputation for fiscal responsibility and be completely free of avaricious intentions (*v. cont.* 2.11). Like Jer. and other patristic authorities, the fourth- or fifth-century author—once erroneously believed to have been Basil of Caesarea (E. Amand de Mendieta, “L’authenticité des lettres ascétiques 42 à 45 de la correspondance de saint Basile de Césarée,” *RSR* 56 [1968]: 241–264)—of a letter on the anchoritic life was aware of the perceived abuses of money-handling within the church, and he cautions a monastic disciple not to allow wealthy Christians ever to entrust him with charitable donations to be distributed to the poor on their behalf, lest he expose himself to accusations of swindling (*Bas. epist.* 42.3). Intentional misappropriation of funds was a problem in monastic culture as well. John Cassian (*coll.* 4.20) is critical of worldly-minded monks who hoard donations under the pretense that they will use this money to found their own monasteries.

*sub praetextu elemosynae quaerunt divitias* At *epist.* 60.11.3 Jer. elaborates on the activities of these duplicitous clerics: *alii nummum addant nummo et,*

*marsuppiū suffocantes, matronarū opes venentur obsequiis; sint ditiores monachi quam fuerant saeculares, possideant opes sub Christo paupere quas sub locuplete diabolo non habuerant, et suspiret eos ecclesia divites quos tenuit mundus ante mendicos; cf. v. Hilar. 10.14 multis nomen pauperum occasio avaritia est.* Julian Pomerius also inveighs against such swindling almoners at v. cont. 3.24.2.

*quae magis venatio appellanda est quam elemosyna. sic bestiae, sic aves, sic capiuntur et pisces: modica in hamo esca ponitur ut matronarum in eo sacculi protrahantur* In late Republican and early imperial Latin literature *captatio* habitually is depicted by a hunting/fishing metaphor: the inheritance-seeker captures his unsuspecting prey using various cunning tricks just as fishermen angle with baited hooks and hunters snare their wild game with nets (cf. Bas. *spir. sanc.* 1.1 παγίς θηρατῶν ... κεκρυμμένον τὸν δόλον καὶ ἐγκατάσκειον ἔχει); see Hor. *epist.* 1.1.78, *sat.* 2.5.25, 44; Sen. *epist.* 8.3; Mart. *epigr.* 2.40.3–4, 4.56.3–6, 5.18.7–8, 6.63.5–6, 9.88.4; Plin. *min. epist.* 9.30.2; Lucian *dial. mort.* 18(8), and on Roman hunting and fishing techniques, see G. Kron, “Animal Husbandry, Hunting, Fishing, and Fish Production,” in J. Oleson (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Engineering and Technology in the Classical World* (Oxford, 2008), 175–224. Jer.’s deployment of this metaphor, like his poignant description of clerical *captatio* above at 6.4–5, thus proceeds along conventional lines, and he achieves additional poignancy by encasing part of the metaphor in a snappy anaphoric and asyndetic tricolon (*sic bestiae, sic aves, sic capiuntur et pisces*). The naturalistic imagery adds a certain picturesque charm to the passage (for this effect, cf. M.J. Holman, *Nature-Imagery in the Works of St. Augustine* [Washington, 1931], 145–146), but its principal intended impact is to arouse the reader’s righteous indignation at the sneaky scheming of these predatory clergymen. This is not the only time that Jer. used this analogy from nature to illustrate a point: several years earlier he had likened sinners taken unawares by death to fish surprised by the hook and birds entangled in a snare (*comm. in Eccl.* 9.7–8 ll. 157–161).

*scit episcopus ... quem dispensationi pauperum curaeque praeficiat* Although bishops had supreme authority over the church budget (see on 6.2 *gloria episcopi est pauperum opibus providere*), they often delegated the oversight of day-to-day administrative operations to deacons or priests, who would be in charge of (among other things) distributing money from the church purse to the needy (cf. Cyp. *epist.* 59.5.2; Isid. Pelus. *epist.* 1.29; Leo *epist.* 111.2). It was the responsibility of the almoner (*dispensator*) to keep

the bishop apprised of anyone in the community who could not otherwise make ends meet (see Ambr. *off.* 2.69).

*episcopus* See on 6.2 *episcopi*.

*melius est non habere quod tribuam quam impudenter petere* The implication of this sweeping pronouncement is rather startling: even if the poor benefit from whatever pittance happens to be left over from the avaricious almoner's selfish extravagances (cf. above *pauperibus parum tribuunt*), it is better that they receive nothing at all than for this corruption to be permitted.

In a similar vein Ambrose (*off.* 1.145) bars clerical almoners from procuring money for the poor through suspect means such as extortion: if *liberalitas* is to have the firmest foundation possible, the money being handed out must have been acquired in an honest fashion.

### 9.3

*sed et genus adrogantiae est clementiorem te videri velle quam pontifex Christi est* Ambrose (*off.* 2.123) similarly warns clerical subordinates not to try to upstage their bishops in their works of mercy toward the needy, for the very attempt to do so stems from a prideful motivation. Nepotian consummately embodied this precept: whatever good he did he ascribed to his bishop and uncle Heliodorus, and whenever his charitable ventures did not succeed in quite the way he had anticipated, he would assume all the blame for himself and insist that Heliodorus had nothing to do with them (*epist.* 60.10.6).

*pontifex Christi* See on 4.4 *pontifex Christi*.

*non omnia possumus omnes* Macrobius (*Sat.* 5.16.6–7) identifies this polyptotic saying as proverbial; its source may be Hom. *Il.* 13.729 ἄλλ' οὐπὼς ἅμα πάντα δυνήσεαι αὐτὸς ἐλέσθαι (cf. Otto, 254). It is first attested in Lucilius (cf. Macrob. *Saturn.* 6.1.35) and later in Virgil (*ecl.* 8.63). Jer. quotes it also at *dial. c. Pel.* 1.24, and at *comm. in Eph.* lib. 1 p. 474 he presents a non-versified variation on it (*non quo omnes omnia consequamur*); cf. *comm. in Is.* lib. 17, prol. ll. 4–5 *non possum omnia in omnibus locis dicere*. Cf. Syn. Cyr. *epist.* 57 οὐχ ἅπας ἅπαντα δύναται.

*alius in ecclesia oculus est, alius lingua, alius manus, alius pes, alius auris, venter et cetera. lege Pauli ad Corinthios: "diversa membra unum corpus*



*efficiunt*" An allusion to Paul's extended corporal metaphor for the church (1Cor. 12:12–27). The ellipse of the word 'letter' (in *lege Pauli ad Corinthios*) is rather common in Jer. (cf. e.g. *comm. in Is.* 49.8 l. 29, *vir. ill.* 5, *epist.* 22.40.3, 119.9.4, 120.9.1, 121.11.1) and other patristic writers (see Adkin, 393). Like Jer., Gregory of Nazianzus (*orat.* 32.10–12) freely adapts the Pauline metaphor when describing the functions of the various members of Christ's body, the church.

*nec rusticus et tantum simplex frater ideo se sanctum putet si nihil noverit* This statement echoes Jer.'s allegation, which he had made a decade earlier in a letter to Marcella, that Roman critics of his biblical scholarship equated lack of sophistication and learning with holiness (*epist.* 27.1.2 *non adeo hebetis fuisse me cordis et tam crassae rusticitatis, quam illi solam pro sanctitate habent piscatorum se discipulos adserentes, quasi idcirco iusti sint, si nihil scierint*). *frater* here generically stands for one's fellow Christian, be he a priest, monk, or ordinary layperson (see on 5.5 *sanctus quilibet frater*). The adjectives *rusticus* and *simplex* do not have inherently polemical overtones here: Jer. is not ridiculing any Christians for being uneducated and uncultured (according to John Cass. *coll.* 10.14, lack of learning is not an impediment to being a good Christian), but only for imagining that this somehow makes them superior to those (like himself) who allegedly are more 'worldly' because they enjoy intellectual and socio-cultural privileges that neither Christ nor the apostles enjoyed (cf. *epist.* 57.12.4 *nec reprehendo in quolibet Christiano sermonis inperitiam ... venerationi mihi semper fuit non verbosa rusticitas, sed sancta simplicitas: qui in sermone imitari se dicit apostolos, prius imitetur in vita*; on the non-polemical concept of *simplicitas* in Jer., see further Antin, 147–162; Meershoek, 10–12). Jer. couples *rusticitas* and *simplicitas* also at e.g. *comm. in Eccl.* 3.18–21 ll. 347–348, *comm. in Os.* 2.13 l. 285, *tract. in Ps.* 78 ll. 29–30 *ego vero simpliciter rusticana simplicitate et ecclesiastica ita tibi respondeo*, *vir. ill.*, *prol.*, *epist.* 49.13.5, 61.3.4, 133.11.2.

*multoque melius est e duobus imperfectis rusticitatem sanctam habere quam eloquentiam peccatricem* *rusticitas* was "the traditional term for linguistic usage which does not correspond to the traditional rules of cultivated language" (C. Mohrmann, *The Latin of Saint Patrick* [Dublin, 1961], 9). Jer. here opposes *rusticitas* to *eloquentia*, using the resulting twofold antithesis (*rusticitatem ... eloquentiam; sanctam ... peccatricem*) to denounce, as undesirable extremes, both holy rusticity and sinful eloquence. He judges the latter to be the greater of two evils and thereby reinforces his criticism, in the previous chapter, of the bombastic eloquence of clerical declaimers. By

the same token, at *epist.* 53.3.3 he grants that a cleric characterized by *sancta rusticitas* is admirable for his virtuousness but points out that such a man actually does more harm than good to the cause of Christianity because he is incapable of properly defending the church against heresy. He elsewhere revisits the *rusticitas sancta—eloquentia peccatrix* antithesis at *comm. in Dan.* 4.12.3 ll. 545–547, *epist.* 18A.4.2, 53.3.6.

Jer. tried to model in his own writings the same ideal of holy eloquence (i.e. the happy medium between *rusticitas sancta* and *eloquentia peccatrix*) that he advocates to Nepotian, and indeed in *Epistula* 52 he subtly positions himself as the embodiment of this very ideal. He accomplishes this not only through his prose style, which is elegant without being pretentiously periodic and florid, but also through his manner of self-presentation. First of all, from the very opening of the letter he adopts the *persona* of a veteran monastic holy man (1.1), thus suffusing the didactic content presented in the remainder of the work with an authoritative mystique. Additionally, although having been schooled in the finest rhetorical tradition of the day (1.2, 4.1) and being therefore capable of putting on a dazzling display of verbal fireworks at will, he condemns such pedantry (ostensibly renouncing in the process his own scholastic heritage) and avows to impart teaching to Nepotian which, while it purports to lack an eloquent casing, is nevertheless full of spiritual substance (4.3). What is more, his lengthy and forceful denunciation of clerical declaimers (ch. 8) implies that he himself does not belong to their number and it thus reinforces his carefully crafted literary identity.

### Chapter 10

This chapter assumes the form of a miniature manifesto against the architectural extravagance on display in some contemporary churches. Wealthy Christian patrons cited the golden furnishings and general opulence of Solomon's Temple as the biblical precedent to justify their own luxurious outfitting of *ecclesiae*. Jer. refutes this argument and concludes that precious ornamentation should be banished from all churches. He of course is objecting to exorbitance, not to the construction of new churches *per se* nor to the meticulous upkeep of existing ones (after all, he later praised Nepotian, after he had died, for having taken great pride in the maintenance of his church, not from a desire for ostentation but from a pious zeal for the house of God; see *epist.* 60.12.2, 4).

This chapter at first glance seems a rather odd fit in the letter for the simple reason that it is embedded in the portion of the work (chs. 5–16) that dispenses ethical imperatives to Nepotian and yet it contains no actual *praecepta vivendi*. Nevertheless, it is not without purpose: Jer. uses this epistolary treatise as an occasion to call for sweeping reform of the ecclesiastical *status quo*, in the hope of enlisting for this cause Nepotian and other sympathetic clerical readers, whom he duly supplies with an ostensibly cogent argument to topple the opposition.

#### 10.1

*multi aedificant parietes et columnas ecclesiae subtrahunt* The singular *ecclesia*, here in the dative as the object of *subtrahunt*, represents the church as the body of Christ. These *columnae* are likewise to be understood figuratively, in cosmic terms, as the spiritual foundation of the church (for this metaphorical sense of *columna*, see e.g. Jer. *comm. in Is.* 3.12 l. 25). Elsewhere Jer. has the pillars of the church represent people—e.g. all believers (*comm. in Gal.* 1.2.9 ll. 79–80) or a more selective group of Christians such as the monastic elite of Egypt (*epist.* 108.14.2); cf. 1 *Clem.* 5.1 (martyrs and confessors as pillars); Greg. Naz. *orat.* 18.1 (Gregory's father as a pillar) and 21.26 (Athanasius as a pillar); Jul. Pom. v. *cont.* 2.2.1 (priests as pillars). His imagery has been taken from the NT. In Gal. 2:9 Peter, James, and John are called *στῦλοι* due to their supportive function; cf. J. Pfammatter, *Die Kirche als Bau* (Rome, 1960), 9–11. Jer.'s *columnae* stand in opposition to the literal *parietes* of individual churches, hence, “many”—Jer. is tactfully allusive and does not identify whole classes of offenders, such as Christian emperors, bishops, and senatorial church patrons—undermine the spiritual integrity of the body of

Christ while they erect magnificent churches. The contrast in the meanings of *parietes* and *columnas*, the antithesis between *aedificant* and *subtrahunt*, and the chiasmic arrangement of the four words in question, all work in tandem to produce a stunning rhetorical effect. These stylistic features as well as its distinctive aphoristic quality make this line a particularly memorable opening to the present chapter. Jer. uses the same building metaphor at *comm. in Agg.* 1.11 ll. 442–446 to denounce self-seeking clergymen who stockpile wealth for themselves and in so doing destroy the Lord's church, while Chrysostom likens true believers to the gold, statues, and costly furnishings in the invisible church which are ravaged by the fire of clerical corruption (*hom. in Eph.* 10.3 [PG 62:78]).

Wright, 215, egregiously mistranslates this passage as, "Many people build churches now with party walls not pillars to support them", and he states in his gloss: "If the text is right Jerome apparently means that a church should consist of one plain room, with no party walls for separate shrines and no columns" (214n2).

*marmora nitent, auro splendent laquearia, gemmis altare distinguitur* This ecphrastic tricolon captures the architectural splendor of the Constantinian and post-Constantinian churches (Jer. dilates on this topic at *comm. in Zach.* 8.6 ll. 160–168 and *epist.* 130.14.7). For instance, Constantine's magnificent Lateran church in Rome, constructed between 312 and 324, featured columns of green Thessalian marble (their postaments and bases were made of white marble) that separated the aisles, large rectangular slabs of yellow Numidian marble that paved the nave's floor, colorful marble revetments, and golden roof beams; see H. Brandenburg, *Ancient Churches of Rome from the Fourth to the Seventh Century* (Turnhout, 2004), 16–54; C. Odahl, "The Christian Basilicas of Constantinian Rome," *AW* 26 (1995): 3–28; on the use of marble in early church architecture more generally, see M. Greenhalgh, *Marble Past, Monumental Present* (Leiden, 2009), 39–81. The Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem, for its own part, was exquisitely adorned with a gold-panelled ceiling and fine marble columns and pavement (Eus. *v. Const.* 3.31–32, 36–37), and the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, where Jer. regularly attended mass and even preached (see on 8.1 *nolo ... eruditissimum*), was comparably decorated (see e.g. R. Hamilton, *The Church of the Nativity, Bethlehem* [Jerusalem, 1947]).

The churches built by the order of Constantine also were equipped with luxurious furnishings. Jer.'s *gemmis altare distinguitur* may evoke (among other examples) the altar that the emperor donated to St. Peter's Basilica in Rome: weighing 350 pounds, it was made of solid gilded silver and was

studded on all sides with prase, pearls, and 210 jacinth jewels (*lib. pont.* 34.18); cf. H. Geertman, “Nota sul *Liber Pontificalis* come fonte archeologica,” in *Quaeritur inventus colitur* (Vatican City, 1989), 347–361 (358). Moreover, Jer.’s criticism was informed by church ornamentation that he had seen first-hand in Rome, Jerusalem, and Bethlehem. His negative judgment was based on moral rather than strictly aesthetic considerations. For him, true Christianity consists in a pure faith, not in a decadently embellished building (*comm. in Hier.* 2.32 ll. 14–20; cf. Aug. *serm.* 15 *qui enim diligit decorem domus dei, non est dubium quia ecclesiam diligit, non in fabrefactis parietibus et tectis, non in nitore marmorum et laqueariis aureis sed in hominibus fidelibus, sanctis, deum diligentibus*; John Chrys. *hom. in Eph.* 10.3 [PG 62:78]). It is the soul that should be beautified with virtues, not churches with precious metals (cf. Lact. *div. inst.* 5.8.4; Pelag. *epist. ad Celant.* 19.2), especially when such expenditures mean that the poor are deprived of the basic necessities of life (Jer. *comm. in Is.* 24.7–13 ll. 38–41, *epist.* 58.7.1, 128.5.1; cf. 22.32.1; see also Max. Tur. *serm.* 17). Chrysostom insists that more attention should be paid to feeding and clothing the poor than to outfitting sanctuaries with gold, costly pavements, walls, and columns. He reminds his congregation that the table and chalice at the Last Supper were not made of gold and he says that God desires golden souls, not golden sacramental vessels (*hom. in Mt.* 50.3–4 [PG 58:508–509]). Rabbula, the monastic bishop of Edessa, is said to have undertaken no new building projects during his episcopate precisely because he preferred that the church’s wealth be lavished on the poor; see G. Bickell, *Ausgewählte Schriften der syrischen Kirchenväter Aphraates, Rabulas und Isaak von Ninive* (Kempten, 1874), 194. Bishop Theophilus of Alexandria, by contrast, was spurned by contemporary and posthumous critics for his craze for building new church structures with money that had been set aside for the poor in Alexandria; see M. Gaddis, *There is No Crime for Those Who have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire* (Berkeley, 2005), 275.

Some twenty years after writing to Nepotian, in a letter to the young virgin Demetrias (*epist.* 130.14.7), Jer. expressed a decidedly more conciliatory attitude regarding church ornamentation. He states that he does not condemn senatorial Christians who sponsor elaborate church-building projects (*non reprehendo, non abnuo*), but he does nevertheless urge Demetrias to spend her fortune on almsgiving. Some scholars (e.g. G. Hellemo, *Adventus domini: Eschatological Thought in 4th-Century Apses and Catecheses* [Leiden, 1989], 137n39) assume that Jer. simply softened his stance over the course of two decades. However, in a sermon delivered on Christmas day, probably in the early 390s and thus around the time that he wrote to Nepotian, he also

refused to condemn church patrons (*non condemno eos qui honoris causa fecerunt, neque enim illos condemno qui in templo fecerunt vasa aurea* [*hom. de nat. dom.* ll. 36–38]). Thus, the discrepancy cannot be attributed to severity tempered with the passage of time, but rather to the rhetorical exigencies of the three individual cases. In *epist.* 130 he is being advisedly circumspect in deference to members of Demetrias' immediate family who were themselves prominent Christian patrons. He delivered the Christmas homily in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, a church which was magnificently decorated, even more so than usual, on the high holy days (see Egeria's [*itin.* 25] picturesque description of the festal decorations in the Church of the Nativity), and present in the audience was not only Jer.'s diocesan bishop John of Jerusalem but also undoubtedly many affluent patrons whom it would have been untactful to offend on such a solemn occasion. Finally, in the letter to Nepotian he is operating solely and unrestrictedly under the presuppositions of an ascetic worldview according to which wealth in any form stands, in its moral valuation, at the opposite end of the spectrum as voluntary monastic poverty (cf. e.g. 5:4 *tu aurum contemnis, alius diligit; tu calcas opes, ille sectatur*).

*laquearia* Hilberg printed *lacunaria* (from *G*, *K*, and *H*) instead of *laquearia*, which is found in the remaining eight of the MSS he collated. This latter reading, adopted in the present edition, is to be given some precedence solely on the basis of Jer.'s own documented usage: he speaks on five other occasions of golden *laquearia* but nowhere else of *aurata lacunaria*.

*ministrorum Christi nulla electio est* I.e. more attention is paid to decorating churches than to recruiting qualified 'ministers of Christ', by whom Jer. means conceivably every church officer from the bishop down to the lower clergy (cf. Bodin, 345–346). The phrase *minister Christi* appears five times in the Vulgate NT, in which *minister* renders three different Greek words: διάκονος (2 Cor. 11:23; Col. 1:7; 1 Tim. 4:6), λειτουργός (Rom. 15:16), and ὑπηρέτης (1 Cor. 4:1). In *epist.* 69 (9.4–5, 10.1) Jer. insists that the church exercise the utmost discretion about whom it appoints to office, and at *adv. Iov.* 1.34 he is highly critical of the favoritism that he claims more often than not causes otherwise worthy candidates to be passed over for opportunists who use their connections to ascend through the clerical ranks. Such corruption drew comment from other like-minded authors. Thus Gregory of Nazianzus: νῦν δὲ κινδυνεύει τὸ πάντων ἀγιώτατον τάγμα τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν πάντων εἶναι καταγελαστότατον. οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀρετῆς μᾶλλον ἢ κακουργίας ἢ προεδρίας, οὐδὲ τῶν ἀξιώτερων ἀλλὰ τῶν δυνατωτέρων οἱ θρόνοι (*orat.* 43.26; cf. *epist.* 40, where

he condemns the interference of favor-seeking power-mongers in episcopal elections); cf. Bas. *epist.* 54; Greg. Nys. *epist.* 17.8–10; John Chrys. *sacerd.* 3.10; Jul. Pom. v. *cont.* 2.2.2. Similarly, Gregory of Nyssa remarks that when Gregory Thaumaturgus was looking to fill the bishopric of Comana Pontica, he searched above all for a candidate who had conducted himself as a holy priest even before being ordained to the priesthood, yet the locals divided into factions which promoted their own candidates on the basis of eloquence, familial ties, and so on (v. *Greg. Thaum.* pp. 36–37 Heil). Origen (*hom.* 6 in *Lev.* 3.1) recommends that there be as many possible lay witnesses to an ordination so that the church community as a whole may be assured by its consensus about the candidate's sterling character.

Given Jer.'s well-documented antipathy toward Ambrose as well as the possibility that he crafted his epistolary treatise to Nepotian as a covert response of sorts to the bishop of Milan's own more fulsome handbook on clerical *officia* (see on 1.1 *dum ... refrenarem*), it is reasonable to assume that in making his sweeping criticism of the ecclesiastical selection process in the present passage he is thinking, at least in part, of Ambrose's overnight promotion to the prestigious bishopric of Milan despite having been an unbaptized catechumen a few weeks earlier. Jer. may well have Ambrose in mind at *epist.* 69.9.4: *heri catechumenus, hodie pontifex; heri in amphitheatro, hodie in ecclesia; vespere in circo, mane in altari; dudum fautor strionum, nunc virginum consecrator*. Spontaneous acclamations of laymen to the priesthood or episcopate, of which Jer. was so critical, were not uncommon in the fourth century; for an overview, see R. Gryson, "Les élections épiscopales en Occident au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *RHE* 75 (1980): 257–283.

*neque vero mihi aliquis opponat dives in Iudaea templum, mensam, lucernas, turibula, patellas, scyphos, mortariola et cetera ex auro fabre facto* For the argumentative device of an objection made by an [imaginary] interlocutor (προκατάληψις), cf. Quint. *inst. orat.* 9.2.36. For Jer.'s deployment of this device in his correspondence, see Hritz, 69–70. He uses it again below at 11.2 (*quodsi obtenderis facere te haec ...*). This *aliquis* theoretically encompasses certain bishops and senatorial patrons who justify their sumptuous spending on church-building projects by appealing to the golden furnishings and utensils in the Solomonic Temple, a small sampling of which are named here: *mensam*, the table for the bread of the Presence (1 Kgs. 7:48); *lucernas* (1 Chr. 28:15; 2 Chr. 4:21); *turibula* (2 Chr. 4:22); *patellas* (1 Kgs. 7:50); *scyphos* (Ezr. 1:9; cf. *comm. in Eccl.* 2.8 ll. 184–186 *scyphos ... auro gemmisque distinctos Salomonem habuisse credendum est*); *mortariola* (2 Chr. 4:19, 22; cf. 1 Macc. 1:23). At *hom. in Mt.* 80.2 (PG 58:726) Chrysostom speaks in generic

terms of just such a lay patron who is eager to donate gold furnishings to a church; cf. Pall. *hist. Laus.* 61.3–4, on how Melania the Younger gave her silk clothing to churches to serve as altar coverings. Contrary to Jer., Paulinus of Nola (*epist.* 13.13) not only condoned but even applauded architectural splendor in churches as befitting the loftiness of the sacramental mysteries that take place within the walls, and this approbation is reflected in the monumental church complex that he constructed around the tomb of St. Felix at Nola; see D. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola: Life, Letters, and Poems* (Berkeley, 1999), 150–156. Nevertheless, it is unknown whether Paulinus, like Jer.'s *aliquis*, felt compelled to justify his view by reverting to OT precedent.

Jer.'s selective inventory of Temple instruments is an allusion to the golden sacramental vessels in use in the wealthier churches of his day. He maintains that they have no place in the house of God, for Christ himself was poor (cf. 10.2 *nunc vero cum paupertatem domus suae pauper dominus dedicavit*). His position would have seemed radical to contemporary mainstream Christians—especially 'secularized' senatorial Christians who enjoyed ecclesiastical pomp and spectacle—but it nevertheless is well within the pale of ascetic ideology of the late fourth and early fifth centuries. Indeed, other monastically-inclined churchmen from this period shared the same basic conviction that golden furnishings are not indispensable to the Christian liturgy, and a good number of them who were bishops—e.g. Ambrose (*off.* 2.137–143), Augustine (Poss. v. *Aug.* 24.15), Cyril of Jerusalem (Soz. *hist. eccl.* 4.25.3–4), and Exsuperius of Toulouse (Jer. *epist.* 125.20.4)—thought that it was perfectly acceptable and even necessary under certain dire circumstances to have the sacred golden vessels melted down and sold for coin which could then be used to feed the famished or redeem captives.

#### 10.2

*tunc haec probabantur a domino ... in quos fines saeculorum decurrerunt*  
Jer. begins dismantling the opposing position by appealing to the same dispensational argument to which he and other Fathers adverted in order to account for why certain OT practices such as circumcision (e.g. Ambr. *epist.* 9.69) and polygamy (e.g. *Aug. civ. dei* 16.25, 38) once were normative but now need not be observed, at least not literally. For instance, it was Origen's belief that even though the Jewish laws are obsolete and therefore not literally binding on Christians, they can still be observed spiritually (*hom. in Ex.* 11.6). A case in point: the animal sacrifices prescribed in Levitical law foreshadow the moral purity of Christians, who offer up their bodies as living sacrifices to God (*comm. in Rom.* 9.1); cf. R.J. Daly, 'Sacrifice in Origen and



Augustine', *StudPatr* 19 (1989): 148–153 (152–153). In this case, Jer. proposes that the order of Temple worship, since it was abrogated with the advent of Christ, cannot be treated as a benchmark for the Christian liturgical apparatus. Its only significance for Christians is typological in nature: it foreshadowed the far greater Christian reality of the church (cf. e.g. Orig. *hom. in Gen.* 6.3, *hom. in Lev.* 10.1), and Jer. supports his point with an evocation of 1 Cor. 10:11 (*haec autem omnia in figura contingebant illis, scripta sunt autem ad correctionem nostram, in quos fines saeculorum devenerunt*). Cf. *comm. in Hiez.* 12.40 ll. 255–271, where he says that though the Jews embellished the Temple with fine materials, Christians are to decorate the church figuratively, by effecting the conversion of sinners. In patristic thought the Temple was seen as the type of the individual Christian soul (cf. e.g. Jer. *epist.* 22.23, 2–3, 58.7.1) or of the church as the body of Christ; see S. Connolly, *Bede: On the Temple* (Liverpool, 1995), xxiii–xxviii; Gryson, 77–84; A. van den Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromateis* (Leiden, 1988), 116–147. The Tabernacle was interpreted likewise; see A.G. Holder, "The Mosaic Tabernacle in Early Christian Exegesis," *StudPatr* 25 (1993): 101–106.

*quamquam* This relative adverb ('though'), when it introduces a concessive clause expressing a clearly acknowledged fact, as it does here, normally takes the indicative in classical prose (see e.g. Gildersleeve-Lodge, §605). Jer.'s subjunctive *praecesserint* reflects the trend in late Latin to use the subjunctive after *quamquam* (cf. Draeger, 2.766–768; Goelzer, 357–358; Skahill, 220–221).

*nunc vero cum paupertatem domus suae pauper dominus dedicarit, cogitemus crucem* The p-/d-/c-alliteration, the parechetic *domus ... dominus*, and the paronomasiac *paupertatem ... pauper* give this passage very striking soundplay whereby Jer. is able to make his point more memorably than otherwise. He employs the *genitivus inversus* construction (*paupertatem domus suae = pauperem domum suam*): in using the noun *paupertatem* he establishes, more concretely and vividly than he could have done with the adjectival *pauperem*, utter disregard for wealth as the defining trait—in the context of the present discussion, that is—of the church.

On the church as the 'house of Christ', cf. e.g. Cyp. *epist.* 60.3.2; Ambros. *quaest.* 52; Jer. *comm. in Hier.* 23.11 l. 1; Paul. Nol. *epist.* 34.7. The epithet *pauper dominus* captures Christ's indigence also at 11.1 as well as at *epist.* 108.15.7; for the theme of the impecunious Savior in patristic literature, see H. Leclercq, *Aspects du monachisme hier et aujourd'hui* (Paris, 1968), 51–67. As a result of Constantine's promotion of the cult of the True Cross (see

A. Frolow, *La relique de la Vraie Croix* [Paris, 1961]) in the middle and late 320s and the 330s, the Cross became, for the first time in the history of Christianity, a ubiquitous symbol of redemption, and it was emblazoned on everything from coins to sarcophagi, and was even featured in tattoos, and alleged relics of the True Cross and miniature replica crosses were carried by the faithful as amulets to ward off evil; see F.J. Dölger, “Das Anhängkreuzchen der hl. Makrina und ihr Ring mit der Kreuzpartikel: ein Beitrag zur religiösen Volkskunde des 4. Jahrhunderts nach der Vita Macrinae des Gregor von Nyssa,” in Id., *Antike und Christentum*, III (Münster, 1932), 81–116; J.W. Drijvers, *Helena Augusta: The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of her Finding of the True Cross* (Leiden, 1992), 81–93; P. Dufraigne, *Adventus Augusti, adventus Christi* (Paris, 1994), 374–384; M. Sulzberger, “Le symbole de la croix et les monogrammes de Jésus chez les premiers chrétiens,” *Byzantion* 2 (1925): 337–448. Here Jer. evokes the Cross as an iconic Christian symbol not of cosmic spiritual victory but of suffering associated with the *pauper dominus*.

The sentiment expressed here by Jer. is echoed by Ambrose: *qui enim sine auro misit apostolos, ecclesias sine auro congregavit* (*off.* 2.137).

*divitias lutum putabimus* Cf. Wis. 7:9 ὁ πᾶς χρυσὸς ἐν ᾧ ψεῖ αὐτῆς ψάμμος ὀλίγη, καὶ ὡς πηλὸς λογισθήσεται ἄργυρος ἐναντίον αὐτῆς. For this image of riches (or ‘gold’) as common dirt, see also e.g. John Chrys. *ad Theod. laps.* 1.3; Jer. *comm. in Is.* 13.17 l. 9, 14.23 l. 34, *comm. in Soph.* 3.19–20 l. 598, v. Hilar. 13.10.

*quid miramur quod Christus vocat iniquum mammonam? quid suspicimus et amamus quod Petrus se non habere testatur?* Jer. strengthens the impact of his condemnation of avarice through *interrogatio*, anaphora, pleonasm (*suspiciamus et amamus*), and *disiunctio* (*miramur ... suspiciamus et amamus; quod Christus ... quod Petrus*). In the second *interrogatio* he alludes to Acts 3:6a (*Petrus autem dixit: argentum et aurum non est mihi*), a verse he quotes on six other occasions. The subtext of the first rhetorical question is the parable of the dishonest steward (Lk. 16:1–13), by which Jesus instructs his disciples to make friends with dishonest wealth in order to have even more means with which to relieve the plight of the poor. For a survey of the various scholarly interpretations of this hermeneutically challenging parable, which A. Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (Tübingen, 1910), 2.495, calls the “*crux interpretum*” of Jesus’ parables, see D.J. Ireland, “A History of Recent Interpretation of the Parable of the Unjust Steward (Luke 16: 1–13),” *WThJ* 51 (1989): 293–318. μαμωνᾶς is the Gr. rendering of the Aram. מַמְוֵנָא, which

derives most likely from מַמְוֹן, ‘that in which one trusts’ (cf. *TDNT* 4:388–390), and the phrase μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας in Lk. 16:9 (= ἀδικῶ μαμωνᾶ, Lk. 16:11) corresponds precisely to the Aram. מַמְוֹן דְּשִׁקְרָא (= “possessions acquired dishonestly”; Jer. glosses *mam[m]ona* as *divitiae* at *comm. in Mt.* 6.24 l. 828, *tract. in Ps.* 83 l. 27, and *epist.* 121.6.13). The phrases *iniquus mam[m]ona* and *mam[m]ona iniquitatis* recur some thirty times in Jer.’s works.

### 10.3

*si tantum litteram sequimur et ... simplex nos delectat historia* Jer. has already laid out the consequences of following the *littera occidens* above at 2.1. According to the Hieronymian exegetical theory and practice, the literal sense of Scripture (here expressed as *littera* and *simplex historia*) should not be divorced from its deeper, spiritual meaning; on Jer.’s high esteem for the ‘spiritual understanding’ of the Bible, see Brown, 139–165; Jay, 215–333.

*cum auro observemus et cetera* Jer.’s ensuing counter-argument amounts to a *reductio ad absurdum*: if in this one respect we follow OT precedent, then in every other respect we must follow it as well and accept Jewish legal prescriptions as being normative for Christians. He had employed this same argumentative device very recently against Jovinian, except ironically he protested that the gradations within the Jewish priesthood must not be minimized because they prefigure the distinctions in the spiritual hierarchy of the church, and to abolish the OT model would be to undermine the very foundation of Christian belief and *praxis* (*adv. Iov.* 2.34).

*ducant pontifices Christi uxores virgines* An allusion to the stipulation that the Jewish high priest may marry only a virgin (Lev. 21:13). Jer.’s proposal here that Christian bishops (see on 4.4 *pontifex Christi*) be permitted to marry virgins is meant to sound outrageously provocative to the ears of practicing ascetics. It is scandalous on two counts: bishops ideally should not marry to begin with (see e.g. *adv. Iov.* 1.20), but even if they do, it should certainly not be to Christian virgins, who already are wedded to their heavenly bridegroom Christ.

*quamvis bonae mentis sit, qui cicatricem habuerit et deformis est, privetur sacerdotio* Elsewhere Jer. applies this principle of Levitical law (Lev. 21:17–21) to churchmen, but he spiritualizes it so that moral rather than physical defects are sufficient to disqualify them from clerical office (*comm. in Soph.* 3.1–7 ll. 119–125, *comm. in Mal.* 3.4 ll. 126–130).

*lepra corporis animae vitiis praeferatur* This fine chiasmic antithesis is an allusion to Lev. 13, which meticulously instructs the Jewish priest how to handle cases of leprosy within the community. Like Jer., Chrysostom juxtaposes bodily leprosy and spiritual uncleanness (*sacerd.* 3.6).

*crescamus et multiplicemur et repleamus terram* Jer. almost always cites this divine commandment (Gen. 1:28) disapprovingly, as he does here, as a relic of the prelapsarian world not applicable to the Christian dispensation (*comm. in Agg.* 1.1 l. 16, *comm. in Eccl.* 3.5 l. 87, *epist.* 22.19.1, 66.3.3, 123.12.2, c. *Helv.* 20, *adv. Iov.* 1.3, 16, 24), and in this respect he is very much in line with the prevailing ascetic treatment of this verse (see Clark, 180–183).

*nec immolemus agnum nec mysticum pascha celebremus quia haec absque templo fieri lege prohibentur* Cf. Dt. 16:1–6.

*figamus septimo mense tabernaculum* An allusion to the Feast of Booths (or Tabernacles); cf. Lev. 23:40–43; Neh. 8:13–18.

*sollemne ieiunium bucina concrepemus* Cf. Joel 2:15.

*spiritalibus spiritalia conparantes* 1 Cor. 2:13c.

*scientesque cum Paulo quod lex spiritalis est* Cf. Rom. 7:14a *scimus enim quod lex spiritalis est.*

*David verba cantantes* On the Latinized form of David's name, which in the present passage should be in the genitive case, see on 2.2 *Abraham multo David senior fuit.*

*“revela oculos meos et considerabo mirabilia de lege tua”* Ps. 118:18 LXX. This is one of Jer.'s favorite verses from the Psalms. He quotes it on sixteen other occasions, on two of which (*comm. in Mal.* 4.4 ll. 65–66, *epist.* 53.4.4) in conjunction with Rom. 7:14a, as in the letter to Nepotian.

*ut dominus quoque noster intellexit et interpretatus est sabbatum* Cf. Mt. 12:1–8.

*aut aurum repudiemus cum ceteris superstitionibus Iudaeorum aut, si aurum placet, placeant et Iudaei, quos cum auro aut probare nobis necesse est aut damnare* Jer. concludes ch. 10 with a strong ultimatum which leaves the

greater Christian community with only one viable alternative: the banishment of *aurum* (“gold” is repeated three times for emphasis)—and, by implication, other precious metals and materials—from all places of worship on the ground that their implementation is inconsistent with Christ’s poverty. This proposed solution is underscored by a ring composition: *repudiemus* occurs near the beginning of the period and *damnare* is postponed to the very end. Jer. employs another technique to make his point more vivid. He has already employed the figure of anadiplosis twice in the letter to Nepotian; see 5.7 *quorum et sacerdotium **proposito et propositum** ornatur sacerdotio*, 6.1 *solis clericis et monachis hoc lege **prohibetur et prohibetur** non a persecutoribus*. Now he does so again: *placet, placeant*. Of these three occurrences only *prohibetur et prohibetur* is of the perfect variety; in the other two the repeated element is inflected according to syntactical requirements. Hritzu, 24, observes that most of the occurrences of this device of repetition in Jer.’s correspondence are of the imperfect kind (it may be noted that Hritzu calls this figure anastrophe, though it is more conventionally known as anadiplosis; see e.g. Lausberg, § 619). In any event, the repetitive *placet, placeant* has the effect of rendering his ultimatum slightly more forceful.

In using the *Iudaei* and their “superstitions” as his foil Jer. is not playing to contemporary negative Christian stereotypes about the Jews; on his attitude toward and relations with the Jews of his own time, see G. Stemberger, “Hieronymus und die Juden seiner Zeit,” in D.-A. Koch and H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *Begegnungen zwischen Christentum und Judentum in Antike und Mittelalter* (Göttingen, 1993), 347–364. As is clear from the foregoing allusions to Jewish feasts and cultic practices, he has in mind the Jews of the OT, not those of the late fourth century AD, who obviously did not worship in the richly equipped Solomonic temple (cf. 10.1). Thus, it is with these pre-Christian *Iudaei* that he equates any Christian who does not outright repudiate ecclesiastical exorbitance.

*Chapter 11*

Jer. lays down guidelines to govern Nepotian's interactions with certain elements of secular society, specifically senatorial aristocrats and authorities of various ranks within the government. He also addresses the issue of consumption of alcohol in any of its many available forms and concedes that the monastic clergyman may imbibe but only in cases of medical necessity.

## 11.1

*convivia tibi vitanda sunt saecularium et maxime eorum qui honoribus tument*

Jer. later echoed this advice in a more condensed form in a letter to Paulinus of Nola: *saecularium et maxime potentium consortia devita* (*epist.* 58.6.3). Here he cautions Nepotian to avoid dinner-parties thrown by non-Christians (*saeculares*; on the term, see Orbán, 193–199), especially senatorial aristocrats who revel in their secular distinctions such as wealth, ancestral nobility, and political offices held (cf. Aug *enarr. in Ps.* 74.1 *exsultent superbi de praesenti felicitate; tumeant honoribus, fulgeant auro, redundant familiis, obsequiis clientium constipentur*)—all of which are subsumed under the word *honores* (for its lexical reach, see H. Drexler, “*Honos*,” *Romanitas* 3 [1961]: 135–157).

Dinner-parties afforded status-conscious hosts the opportunity to flaunt their wealth and social standing: ancestral *imagines* and *stemmata* proudly displayed in the entrance-hall (cf. M.R. Pelikan Pittenger, *Contested Triumphs* [Berkeley, 2008], 279–280), the fashionableness of the home and its costly mosaics, wall paintings, and other decorations, as well as lavish expenditure on exotic dishes and banquet-entertainment (cf. Sen. *brev. vit.* 12.5; John Chrys. *hom. in Ign. mart.* 1 οἱ πολυτελεῖς καὶ φιλότιμοι τῶν ἐστι-ατόρων πυκνὰς καὶ ἐπαλλήλους ποιοῦνται τὰς ἐστιάσεις, ὁμοῦ μὲν τὴν οἰκείαν περιουσίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενοι); see S.P. Ellis, “Power, Architecture, and Decor: How the Late Roman Aristocrat Appeared to his Guests,” in E.K. Gazda (ed.), *Roman Art in the Private Sphere* (Ann Arbor, 1991), 117–134. These meetings fostered a sense of community among senatorial aristocrats, providing them with a relaxed atmosphere in which to strengthen friendships, trade gossip, and cement business, political, and literary connections, but for the ascetically-minded Christian they were a breeding-ground for temptation. Jer. accordingly warns numerous spiritual advisees against attending these social affairs, lest they succumb to gluttony, drunkenness, or lust (*epist.* 58.6.1, 79.7.6, 117.6.3–4, 130.14.3; cf. c. *Vig.* 1; see also Cyp. *hab. virg.* 18, 21; Ps.-Cyp. *sing. cler.* 4 *minus voluptatibus stimulat, qui non est ubi*

*frequentia est voluptatum*), yet such sensual indulgences are precisely what attract voluptuary clerics to these social gatherings (cf. *epist.* 125.6.3); at *epist.* 69.9.3 he says that godly bishops have no business putting on banquets, and Chrysostom casts aspersions on aristocratic banquets because the money wasted on them could be better spent on feeding the poor (*hom. in Mt.* 77.5 [PG 58:708]). In the present case Jer's principal concern is fraternization with government officials, which itself implies entanglement in worldly affairs. According to Chrysostom (*sacerd.* 6.4), priests should be as adept in the affairs of the world as those who engage in them but also (paradoxically) as disentangled from them as monastic recluses are.

*turpe est ante fores sacerdotis domini crucifixi et pauperis ... lictores consulum et milites excubare iudicemque provinciae melius apud te prandere quam in palatio* Lictors were the most visible of all a senior magistrate's staff: they preceded him wherever he went, announcing his approach and carrying on their left shoulders the fasces, which were the traditional symbols of his *imperium*, and they also might serve as his bodyguards; see C.J. Fuhrmann, *Policing the Roman Empire: Soldiers, Administration, and Public Order* (Oxford, 2012), 61–64. The lictors mentioned here by Jer. serve the highest magistrates of Rome, the consuls (*lictore consulum*), and if they wait outside a personal residence it means that a consul is inside socializing with the homeowner, who in this case is a Christian *sacerdos*, an ambiguous term which could mean either presbyter or bishop (see on 7.3 *sacerdotes*) but probably the latter, given the circumstances of a social call by a consul. Additionally, soldiers “stand guard” outside (this is the primary sense of *excubare*; cf. *TLL* V 2 ix.1289.6 ff.)—a further indication of the singular importance of the visiting magistrate. Jer's point is that a “priest”, be he a presbyter or bishop, should not make it his ambition to move in high social or political circles, whether this entails entertaining senior government officials at his home or hosting judges to whom he serves meals more sumptuous than the ones they eat in their royal residences (*turpe est ... iudicemque provinciae melius apud te prandere quam in palatio*).

With the present passage we may compare *comm. in Mic.* 2.9–10 ll. 313–315, 318–328, where Jer. inveighs against self-indulgent *sacerdotes* who neglect the poor and pander to the politically mighty: *an non confusio et ignominia est, Iesum crucifixum, magistrum, pauperem atque esurientem fartis praedicare corporibus ... sanctum utique est et apostolorum ministerium, viduis et pauperibus ministrare. non oportet, inquit, dimisso sermone dei, ministrare nos mensis. at nunc non dico pauperes, non dico fratres, et qui rursum invitare non possint, ex quibus, excepta gratia, nihil aliud episcopales*

*sperent manus, sed militantes et accinctos gladio, et iudices, excubantibus ante fores suas centurionibus et turmis militum, Christi sacerdos invitat ad prandium. tota clerici urbe discurrunt, quaerunt exhibere iudicibus quae illi in praetoriis suis aut invenire non possunt, aut certe inventa non coemunt.* There are notable phraseological and contextual similarities between the two passages in question: the offending “priest” is alternately *sacerdos domini* and *Christi sacerdos*; *pauper* and *crucifixus* are juxtaposed as dominical epithets (these are in fact the only two places where Jer. couples these adjectives); there is the concurrence of the uncommon expression *ante fores excubare* (for other instances, cf. Tibull. *carm.* 1.3.72; Curt. Ruf. *hist. Alex.* 8.6.18; Pont. v. *Cyp.* 15.5; Jer. *comm. in Ab.* 3.7 ll. 410–411) to describe the activities of bodyguard-soldiers (*centurionibus et turmis militum*); prandial obsequiousness to judges (*iudicemque provinciae melius apud te prandere quam in palatio—iudices ... invitat ad prandium*). These similarities aside, the passage in the letter to Nepotian is considerably more compressed than its counterpart. Jer. completed his *Commentary on Micah* prior to composing *Epistula* 52 (for the chronology, see P. Nautin, “L’activité littéraire de Jérôme de 387 à 392,” *RThPh* 115 [1983]: 247–259), and so in this latter work he streamlined the earlier, more diffuse satiric description that he had given when commenting on the Minor Prophet.

The phrase *apud te* = ‘at your home’; for this sense of the preposition, see A. Gagnér, *Studien zur Bedeutung der Präposition Apud* (Uppsala, 1931), 11–13.

*qui cibo quoque vescebatur alieno* In classical comedy eating “someone else’s food” (*alienus cibus*) was notoriously an avocation of the parasite; see e.g. Antiph. fr. 243–244 Kock; Eubul. fr. 72 Kock; Plaut. *Capt.* 77, *Pers.* 58; Ter. *Eun.* 265; cf. Juv. *sat.* 5.1–2. In the present case, however, Jer. cites Christ’s reliance upon others for his meals as a qualification of the epithet *pauper*, to illustrate how impoverished he truly was.

## 11.2

*quodsi obtenderis facere te haec ut roges pro miseris atque subiectis* Jer. employs the figure of *προκατάληψις*, as he did above at 10.1 (*neque vero mihi aliquis opponat ...*), except this time the anticipated objection is registered more directly, in the second-person voice, not by Nepotian, as seems at first glance to be the case, but by the cleric who makes excuses for his pandering to secular authorities. Jer. introduces an objection using the formula *quodsi obtenderis* also in *epist.* 108.24.2. Chrysostom (*sacerd.* 3.14) opts for a more sympathetic approach by defending bishops who are unfairly accused of



pandering if they frequently visit the rich with an eye to securing from them some financial benefit for the church.

*iudex saeculi plus defert clerico continenti quam diviti et magis sanctitatem tuam veneratur quam opes* In this neatly constructed period Jer., by means of *disiunctio* (cf. Lausberg, § 739 ff.) and antithesis, draws a sharp and vivid contrast between two extremes in clerical behavior, as this behavior is perceived, that is, by secular authorities. He is playing on the stereotype, which would have been readily familiar to his contemporary readers, of the judge as a wealthy individual (a significant portion of his compensation came in fact in the form of extortion-money and bribes accepted from those who sought his favoritism; see Jones, 399–400; cf. Jer. *comm. in Eccl.* 3.16–17 ll. 258–259 *inter iudicum ipsa subsellia non veritatem valere sed munera*). Thus, what Jer. is implying is that the secular judge will respect a churchman who is holy rather than rich because his own wealth, albeit amassed by questionable means, far outrips that of a voluntarily poor monastic clergyman anyway, and furthermore he will admire in this impecunious man of God what he does not himself have, namely moral rectitude (this is a universal reaction, according to Greg. Naz. *orat.* 24.17 *πᾶσι γὰρ ὁμοίως τὸ καλὸν αἰδέσιμον*). For the same notion that secular magistrates inherently respect clergymen for their personal holiness, see Greg. Naz. *orat.* 17.12.

*clerico* See on 1.1 *clericus*.

*libenter carebo* This same expression is used again below at 11.4 but nowhere else in Jer.

*Christum rogabo pro iudice, qui magis subvenire potest* For Christ as the only infallible and all-merciful *iudex*, see J. Harries, “Constructing the Judge: Judicial Accountability and the Culture of Criticism in Late Antiquity,” in R. Miles (ed.), *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity* (London, 1999), 214–233 (215–218).

*melius est enim confidere in domino quam confidere in homine. melius est sperare in domino quam sperare in principibus* Jer. incorporates this quotation of Ps. 117:8–9 LXX into the natural flow of his prose (i.e. he inserts *enim*, which is not present in the original) but does not identify it as a biblical text. At *tract. in Ps.* 145 ll. 29–31 he paraphrases this text and adds secular judges to the list of those in whom the Christian should place no trust (*nolite confidere in principibus, non in imperatore, non in praeffectis, non in iudicibus saeculi*).

From a purely stylistic standpoint this unattributed quotation—with its dense aggregation of rhetorical figures, including *disiunctio* (cf. Lausberg, § 739 ff.), asyndetic anaphora, epizeuxis (*confidere ... confidere; sperare ... sperare*; cf. Lausberg, § 617), antithesis (*domino ... homine; domino ... principibus*), and isocolon—is an appropriate fit for the elegant prose of the letter to Nepotian.

### 11.3

*redoleas* In his usage of the verb *redolere* Jer. overwhelmingly prefers its figurative sense (e.g. *Prol. in lib. Salom. de hebr. transl.* p. 957 *ipse stilus Graecam eloquentiam redolet*, *comm. in Is.* 3.6.9–10 l. 40, *comm. in Zach.* lib. 3, prol. l. 10; *comm. in Gal.* lib. 2, prol. l. 44, *apol. c. Ruf.* 1.20, *epist.* 24.5.1, 36.14.2, 38.2.2, 39.1.3, 52.9.1, *epist. ad Praes.* 2) to its literal sense (e.g. *comm. in Hiez.* 2.6.13 ll. 511–512, 529, *epist.* 29.1.2).

*ne audias illud philosophi: “hoc non est osculum porrigere sed propinare”* The identity of the “philosopher” who coined this maxim as well as Jer.’s (literary?) source for it remain a mystery (see Hagendahl, 194). The saying, in its original context, probably refers to the *ius osculi*, the social obligation of blood relations up to the sixth degree to kiss female relatives on the mouth, in a non-erotic way, each time they would see her; cf. P. Moreau, “*Osculum, basium, savium*,” *RPh* 52 (1978): 87–97 (94–95). According to the rather amusing explanation given by several Roman writers (Athen. *deipn.* 10.440–441; Aul. Gell. *noct. Att.* 10.23; Plin. *mai. nat. hist.* 14.90; cf. Tert. *apol.* 6.4), this custom originated as a pretense for men to check the breath of their female relatives and make sure that they were not illicitly imbibing alcohol. In deploying this *sententia* here Jer. adds a touch of erudite *variatio* to his moralizing discourse as he attempts to transfer to clerical culture the social taboo regarding secret alcohol addiction among women. Like Jer., Novatian (*cib. iud.* 6) uses the expression and wrests it from its original context, applying it to people who begin drinking at the crack of dawn and are inebriated whenever they greet friends and relatives in the street.

*vinolentos sacerdotes et apostolus damnat et vetus lex prohibet* Cf. Lev. 10:9; 1 Tim. 3:3; Tit. 1:7. Jer. attacks clerical drunkards also at *comm. in Is.* 5.11–12 ll. 15–17, *comm. in Tit.* 1.6–7 ll. 418–444; cf. Greg. Nys. *v. Mos.* 2.286.

*qui altari serviunt vinum et siceram non bibant* This categorical prohibition is an amalgamation of phraseology from both the NT (1 Cor. 9:13 *qui altario*

*deserviunt*) and OT (Jdg. 13:4 *cave ergo ne vinum bibas ac siceram*). The internal arrangement of the echoes neatly corresponds to the NT-OT ordering in the previous sentence (*et apostolus damnat et vetus lex prohibet*). In the Bible wine and *šēkār* frequently appear together: see Lev. 10:9; Num. 6:3; Dt. 14:26, 29:5; Jdg. 13:4, 7, 14; 1 Sam. 1:15; Is. 5:11, 22, 24:9, 28:7, 29:9, 56:12; Mic. 2:11; Prov. 20:1, 31:4, 6; Sir. 40:20; Lk. 1:15.

*sicera Hebraeo sermone omnis potio nuncupatur, quae inebriare potest* Jer. again displays his erudition in Hebrew philology (cf. above 3.7–8). He glosses *sicera* (LXX σίκερα; Heb. שֵׁכָר, *šēkār*) as *ebrietas*, or some variation on *omnis potio quae inebriare potest* (which is inspired by Lev. 10:9a *vinum et omne quod inebriare potest*), also at e.g. *hebr. nom.* pp. 50 & 65 Lagarde, *comm. in Is.* 5.11–12 l. 8, 5.22 l. 20, 24.7–13 l. 25, 28.5–8 l. 48, *comm. in Hiez.* 13.44 ll. 1685–1686. Some scholarly authorities have suggested that *šēkār* is beer (for references, see Koehler-Baumgartner, 1501), but it is probably most advisable to take it as “a generic term for ‘intoxicants’ that might well have included beer” (J.M. Sasson, “The Blood of Grapes: Viticulture and Intoxication in the Hebrew Bible,” in L. Milano [ed.], *Drinking in Ancient Societies* [Padova, 1994], 399–419 [400]).

*sive illa frumento conficitur sive pomorum suco* Hilberg printed *fermento* but it is altogether unclear on the authority of what (if any) MS(S) his editorial decision rested. Be that as it may, his *apparatus criticus* reports only one variant reading, *frumento*, which is given by N. I have preferred this latter *lectio*. First of all, the disputed word is syntactically parallel to *suco* in that both verbal units are in the ablative and are governed by *conficitur*, and both are marked off by their own *sive*. It follows that this parallelism should extend to the sense of both words and thus that the disputed word, like its counterpart *suco*, must be a base substance out of which an alcoholic decoction is manufactured. Now, *fermentum* can mean either the fermentation process itself or a fermenting agent such as yeast. Here it would have to mean “yeast” because *conficitur* already encompasses the act of fermentation. However, alcoholic beverages are not made *out of* yeast; they are made *with* yeast. Therefore, Hilberg’s *fermento* fails to preserve the concinnity that the bicolon in question was demonstrated above to require. By contrast, *frumento* does maintain the parallelism because grain (*frumentum*), like fruit juices (*pomorum suco*) (cf. Plin. mai. *nat. hist.* 14.103), was a material out of which the Romans made alcoholic drinks (cf. Amm. Marc. 26.8.2). Moreover, Jer. later echoed the present passage at *comm. in Is.* 28.5–8 ll. 49–51 *siceram autem omnem*

*potionem ... sive illa frumento sive hordeo sive millio pomorumque suco ... conficiatur.*

*aut favi decoquantur in dulcem et barbaram potionem aut palmarum fructus exprimuntur in liquorem coctisque frugibus aqua pinguior colatur* Jer. is referring, respectively, to the manufacturing of mead (cf. Plin. mai. *nat. hist.* 14.113–115; Diod. Sic. 5.26.2–3), date wine (cf. Plin. mai. *nat. hist.* 14.102; Jer. *comm. in Is.* 28.5–8 l. 50), and a distilled beverage made from either the grain or fruit of field crops such as corn.

*quidquid inebriat et statum mentis evertit, fuge similiter ut vinum* The mind-altering effects of wine and other potable intoxicants to be avoided are mentioned also at *comm. in Is.* 5.11–12 l. 8, 24.7–13 ll. 25–26, 28.5–8 ll. 48–49, *comm. in Hiez.* 13.44 ll. 1683–1685, *comm. in Am.* 2.9–11 ll. 335–336, 4.1–3 l. 31, *comm. in Tit.* 1.6–7 ll. 440–442. Indulgence in alcohol is a gateway to other vices at *comm. in Is.* 5.22 ll. 17–23, *adv. Iov.* 1.34, *epist.* 69.9.1; cf. Plin. mai. *nat. hist.* 14.149; Jul. Pom. *v. cont.* 3.6.1. Julian of Pomerius' prohibition is as far-reaching as Jer.'s: *in vini enim usu non a vino tantum sed ab omnibus quae accipientes inebriant ... abstinebit* (*v. cont.* 2.23.2). In similar terms Chrysostom explains why the clergyman should avoid wine: παραφορὰν γὰρ ἐργάζεται ... καὶ κἄν μὴ μέθην ἐργάσῃται, διαχεῖ τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς εὐτονον, διαλύει τὸ συγκεκροτημένον (*hom. in 1 Tim.* 11.1 [PG 62:555]). Chrysostom himself was said to have abstained from wine because it made him feel dizzy (Pall. *dial.* 12). Some desert Fathers likewise condemned over-indulgence in, and even simply consumption of, alcoholic beverages; see e.g. *apoph. patr.* Xious 1, Poemen 19 (PG 65:312, 328).

#### 11.4

*nec hoc dico quod dei a nobis creatura damnetur, siquidem et dominus vini potator appellatur et Timotheo dolenti stomachum modica vini sorbitio relaxata est ... quodsi absque vino ardeo ... libenter carebo poculo, in quo suspicio veneni est* A decade earlier Jer. had told Eustochium to avoid wine as if it were poison (*epist.* 22.8.1 *ut sponsa Christi vinum fugiat pro veneno*). On account of this prohibition his Roman critics were quick to accuse him of a being a Manichaean who regarded the material world as being fundamentally unclean. In his *Commentary on Galatians* (3.5.19–21 ll. 159–168), which he composed during the summer of 386 and thus a year after he had left Rome, Jer. unequivocally defended his controversial remark, clarifying that he was condemning not a creation of God but the immoral behavior

stemming from the abuse of this creation. And, to assure his readership that his original remark was not made out of ignorance of NT teaching, he went on to cite Christ's consecration of wine at the Last Supper (Mt. 26:27) as well as Paul's allowance to Timothy to partake of wine in moderation for its health benefits (1 Tim. 5:23) (he had quoted this same Pauline text at *epist.* 22.8.3). In the letter to Nepotian Jer., without explicitly mentioning this controversy, tries to head off potential criticism by appealing to the same Pauline instruction to Timothy and to the fact that Christ drank wine (his *dominus vini potator appellatur* evokes Mt. 11:19a, where Christ's detractors accuse him of being a glutton and a *potator vini*). Furthermore, he has gone to great lengths to temper his previously incendiary tone and opts instead for a more pastoral approach (cf. Cain 2009b). Not only does he present abstention from wine as a matter of personal choice for the enlightened conscience (*libenter carebo*), but also he frames his exhortation in the first-person voice, which enables him to identify with the clerical Everyman in an ostensibly personalized way and thereby shed the *persona* of an aloof and imperious moralist. Additionally, while he does retain the 'poison' rhetoric, he stops short of explicitly equating *vinum* with *venenum* and instead uses the hypallagic *poculum* in place of *vinum* and *suspicio veneni* for the more direct *venenum*.

*suculento validoque sum corpore* Evidently the only other Latin author to juxtapose these two adjectives as descriptors of physical conditioning is Augustine (*div. quaest. oct. trib. 73 habitum corporis, secundum quem dicimus alium alio esse suculentiores et validiores* ...). The adjective *suculentus* ('juicy' or 'full of vital fluid'; *OLD* sv) is first attested in Apuleius (*met.* 2.2 [*suculenta gracilitas* as a physical quality of a young man], 10.15). At Paul. Nol. *carm.* 24.631 it describes the body with its propensity to lust. Among late antique authors the adjective is used also by Prudentius (*perist.* 10.433, *hamart.*, praef. 58) and Sidonius (*epist.* 1.2.3).

*pulchre dicitur apud Graecos, sed nescio utrum apud nos aeque resonet* The adverb *pulchre* introduces pointed sayings also at *comm. in Is.* 2.7 l. 10, 27.1 l. 61, 66.18–19 l. 36, *comm. in Hiez.* 1.1 l. 250, *ibid.* 6.18 l. 311, *comm. in Gal.* 3.5.18 ll. 141, 176, *epist.* 133.2.1. Here *nos* = *Latinos*, dovetailing with *Graecos*. Jer. voices concern that the *verbatim* translation he presents will not sound properly Latinate (cf. *epist.* 57.11.4 *quanta enim apud Graecos bene dicuntur, quae, si ad verbum transferamus, in Latino non resonant, et e regione, quae apud nos placent, si vertantur iuxta ordinem, apud illos displicebunt*; see also *epist.* 106.48.2). The implication is that something of the beauty

and the force of the apophthegm in its original Greek is lost in translation.

*“pinguis venter non gignit sensum tenuem”* A literal, non-versified translation—presumably Jer’s own rendering—of παχείᾳ γαστῆρ λεπτόν οὐ τίττει νόον, an iambic trimeter from an unknown Attic comic playwright (*comic. adesp.* fr. 1234 = *iamb. adesp.* fr. 16). This line was proverbial among both the Greeks and Latins (cf. Otto, 363–364) for encapsulating the principle that excessive indulgence in food and alcohol, the root cause of the παχείᾳ γαστῆρ, dulls the mind (e.g. by inducing slumber); cf. Hor. *sat.* 2.2.77; Sen. *epist.* 15.3; Plin. *mai. nat. hist.* 11.79; Tert. *ieiun.* 6; Jer. *epist.* 43.2.1; John Cass. *inst.* 5.6; Jul. Pom. *v. cont.* 2.22.2. It is quoted by the anonymous author of the first-century AD medical treatise Ἱατρικὰ (§ 16; text in H. Diels, *Anonymi Londinensis ex Aristotelis iatricis Menoniis et aliis medicis eclogae* [Berlin, 1893], 1–74) and a de-versified form (γαστῆρ ἢ παχείᾳ τὸν νοῦν οὐ τίττει τὸν λεπτόν) is found in Galen’s *Thrasylulus* (Kühn, 5.878). Two Greek patristic authors quote it *verbatim*, Gregory of Nazianzus, in one of his poems, in reference to gluttony (*carm.* 1.2.10.589 [PG 37:723]), and Chrysostom, in a sermon, in reference to drunken and dissolute living (*hom. in 1Tim.* 13.4 [PG 62:569]). It had some currency among the Latins as well. In addition to Jer. here, the scholiast on Persius 1.56–57 (*qui pote? vis dicam? nugaris, cum tibi, calve, pinguis aqualiculus protenso sesquipede extet*) alludes to it: *tractus sensus ex graeco versu, quo significatur ex ventre crasso tenuem sensum non nasci*.

As for Jer’s source for this verse, Lübeck, 103, suggested Galen as the most likely candidate, and he was followed by Courcelle, 75n5, Hagendahl, 194–195, and Pease, 82n7. There is nothing inherently objectionable about this suggestion, though by the same token Gregory of Nazianzus, from whose poetry Jer. had a documented tendency to appropriate phraseology (see e.g. N. Adkin, “*Heri catechumenus, hodie pontifex* (Jerome, *Epist.* 69.9.4),” *AClass* 36 [1993]: 113–117), should not be eliminated as the possible source (none of the aforementioned scholars seem to have been aware of Gregory’s quotation of the verse in question). Chrysostom, by contrast, can safely be eliminated on the basis of chronology. He evidently delivered his series of homilies on 1 Timothy around 402 (so A. Nägele, “Des Johannes Chrysostomus Homilien zu den Timotheusbriefen des hl. Apostels Paulus und die Zeit ihrer Abfassung,” *ThQ* 116 [1935]: 117–142 [141–142]) and thus close to a full decade after Jer. had penned his letter to Nepotian.

Be that as it may, even if Jer’s source cannot be pinned down with absolute precision, his reasons for incorporating the line into his narrative on

the dangers of clerics drinking wine nonetheless seem transparent. He elegantly encloses his *excursus* between two aphoristic book-ends (i.e. “*hoc non est osculum porrigere sed propinare*” and “*pinguis venter non gignit sensum tenuem*”): the ring composition gives the section a certain structural coherence, and the compelling opening and strong finish render the argument that much the more poignant—and indeed it needs maximal poignancy if Jer. hopes to persuade clergymen to abstain from such a staple potable of late Roman culture of which even most of them would routinely have partaken. Wine-drinking, including toasting at banquets, was common even at church-related social functions of the period (see C. Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* [2 vols., Vaduz, 1988], 2.58–59), even with monks in attendance. For instance, in a famous letter (*epist.* 58) to Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus describes a symposium that he attended after being ordained at which monks were present and imbibed alcohol; see N. McLynn, “Among the Hellenists: Gregory and the Sophists,” in J. Børtnes and T. Hägg (eds.), *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections* (Copenhagen, 2006), 213–238 (228–233).

Furthermore, these two adages serve to elevate the tone of the discourse, and, inasmuch as ancient authors often deployed moralistic *sententiae* such as these to showcase the universal reach of their knowledge of the human condition (cf. P. Sinclair, *Tacitus the Sententious Historian* [University Park, Md., 1995], 147), Jer. quotes them in part to convey the forceful impression that his grasp of his subject matter is comprehensive and therefore that his counsel is trustworthy. Finally, since the bloated belly is a classic symptom of over-consumption of not only alcohol but also food (cf. e.g. Jer. *comm. in Ion.* 2.7 ll. 247–248), Jer.’s citation of this second aphorism to conclude his section on the dangers of wine-drinking has an additional relevance because it facilitates a smooth transition to the immediately following section in which he lays down some fundamental principles involving food intake and fasting.

Gnomic sayings occupied an unusually prominent place in Roman literary culture *writ large*. During the elementary phase of their education as well as during their study of grammar and literature under a *grammaticus*, schoolchildren were forced to memorize scores of primarily moralizing *sententiae* (cf. T. Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* [Cambridge, 1998], 144–145), and later, during their formal training in rhetoric, they learned how to implement them effectively as ornaments of speech and prose. Jer. had an incredible fondness for sententious formulations, be they his own original coinages or, more often, adaptations of others’ sayings, and they recur at a very high frequency in his works. For a long but

nonetheless incomplete list of references to popular proverbs in his writings, see under “Hieronymus” in Otto, 414–416.



## Chapter 12

Jer. prescribes for Nepotian a moderate fasting regimen that entails the consumption of only bread and water. He focuses most of his attention, however, on polemicizing against ascetics who practice hypocritical fasting, i.e. they imagine themselves pious if they abstain from certain bland foods such as bread and yet indulge in uncommon or exotic fare.

## 12.1

*tantum tibi ieuniorum inpone quantum ferre potes* Moderate fasting is recommended also by e.g. Augustine (*epist.* 220.11), John Cassian (*coll.* 2.17, 5.18, *inst.* 5.8), and Julian Pomerius (*v. cont.* 2.22.1). On the one hand Jer. praises Marcella and Nepotian for achieving the golden mean in their fasting (*epist.* 60.10.7, 127.4.2) but on the other hand he lauds Paula for her rigorous fasting (*epist.* 108.1.4, 108.17.3), which she imposed not only on herself but also on her nuns in Bethlehem to quell their sexual appetites (*epist.* 108.20.5). He condemns prolonged fasts and an unnecessarily severe dietary regimen at *epist.* 22.17.2, 54.10.5, 79.4.3, 107.10.2, 130.11.1 (cf. Ambr. *virg.* 3.4.17; Aug. *praec.* 3.1; John Cass. *coll.* 2.26, 21.22, *inst.* 5.9), and he tells Rusticus that a temperate diet is good for both the body and soul (*epist.* 125.7.1).

*sint pura, casta, simplicia, moderata, non superstitiosa ieunia* For the sake of vividness Jer. uses asyndeton to present his agglomeration of adjectives characterizing ideal fasts, and these modifiers are further underscored, both individually and collectively as a group, by their hyperbatic displacement of *ieunia* from *sint*.

*non superstitiosa* By *superstitiosa* Jer. does not mean “superstitious” in the conventional sense of the word; the adjective may be translated as such, but an explanation of the underlying concept is in order. In the context of this chapter, practitioners of *superstitiosa ieunia* imagine that fasts with the traditional monastic fare of bread and water are unheroic and even illegitimate because these things are easily obtainable anywhere (cf. 12.2 *quia gloriam non habet et omnes pane et aqua vivimus, quasi publicum et commune ieunium non putatur*), and they instead consume foods and drinks which are harder to procure (see following n.), equating their rarity with holiness. In Jer.’s view, their superstitiousness consists in their fundamentally flawed understanding of proper ascetic practice, and, by extension, of true religion. Not only that, but also the fact that some of the food items which Jer.

lists below were relatively scarce commodities (cf. below *molestias quasdam difficultatesque ciborum*) and therefore obtainable only by those with considerable financial resources at their disposal (see below on *piper*), implies that these ascetics are in fact in violation of the monastic principle of voluntary poverty.

*quid prodest oleo non vesci et molestias quasdam difficultatesque ciborum quaerere?* This rhetorical question specifically addresses the issue of “superstitious” fasts, the last item on the immediately preceding list (see previous n.). Jer. is attacking ascetics who pride themselves on not consuming oil (i.e. as a condiment for vegetables or bread)—sparing use of or complete abstention from which was a marker of great self-restraint in early Christian monastic culture (see e.g. John Chrys. *virg.* 79.2; Jer. *adv. Iov.* 2.13, v. *Hilar.* 5.3, *epist.* 22.9.1, 107.10.2, 108.17.3; Pelag. *epist. ad Dem.* 18; John Cass. *coll.* 8.1; Geront. v. *Mel.* 22, 24, 62)—and yet go to considerable lengths to cultivate a diet rich in diverse foods, and the pleonastic *molestias ... difficultatesque* as well as the asyndetic listing of selected foods (*caricae ... pistatia*) italicize this point. The targets of his criticism may include, in addition to Christian monks, contemporary Manichaean xerophagists (so V. Grimm, *From Feasting to Fasting: The Evolution of a Sin* [London, 1996], 171).

Nepotian was later portrayed by Jer. as having embodied the dietary ideal advocated in *Epistula* 52, especially with regard to his avoiding *superstitio* in his selection of foods: *mensae avunculi intererat et sic adposita quaeque libabat ut et superstitionem fugeret et continentiam reservaret* (*epist.* 60.10.7).

*caricae* Figs are frequently mentioned in the literary sources as being part of the diet of monks (e.g. Anon. *hist. mon.* 8.40; Jer. v. *Hilar.* 3.1, 5; John Cass. *coll.* 8.1, *inst.* 5.40; Pall. *hist. Laus.* 36.3). Jer. regards them as a delicacy at *adv. Iov.* 2.5. Figs, both pressed and dried, were the most popular fruit consumed in Palestine in Jer.’s day (Safrai, 77–78; cf. André, 74, 87).

*piper* Pepper, in both its white and black varieties, was one of the spices that Romans imported from India, to which area of the world it was indigenous; see G. Parker, *The Making of Roman India* (Cambridge, 2008), 150–153. It was a luxury condiment whose usage probably was restricted to wealthier households.

*nuces* Nuts were a regular component of the eastern monastic diet (e.g. Anon. *hist. mon.* 8.40) and they also were eaten by all social classes in the late Roman Empire; see M. van der Veen, “Food as embodied Material Culture:

Diversity and Change in Plant Food Consumption in Roman Britain," *JRA* 21 (2008): 83–109. Even though nuts of many varieties were readily and cheaply available, Jer. associates them with dietary self-indulgence (cf. *adv. Iov.* 2.5).

*palmarum fructus* Dates were a popular delicacy in Roman culture. They often were used as a culinary flavoring (André, 83), and eastern monks who lived in the wild would scavenge for them (Anon. *hist. mon.* 8.40, 12.16; John Cass. *inst.* 10.24; Pall. *hist. Laus.* 36.2).

*simila, mel* Both of these victuals are named as staples of the peasant's diet above at 6.3.

*pistatia* Pistachio trees were first successfully transplanted from Syria onto Italian soil in the first century AD. The fruit of these trees, the pistachio nut (Jer. curiously lists it separately from *nuces* above), was moderately expensive in Roman Italy (André, 87). Pistachios were cultivated locally in Jer.'s late antique Palestine but they also were imported from elsewhere, and the imported ones commanded much higher prices (Safrai, 219).

*tota hortorum cultura vexatur ut cibario non vescamur pane* The hyperbatic displacement of *pane* from its adjectival modifier *cibario* emphasizes the lengths to which these sham ascetics go in order to avoid eating "common bread" (cf. on 6.3 *cibario pane*); the rhetorical profile of this sentence is further enhanced by parechesis (*vexatur ... vescamur*). Cf. Jul. Pom. *v. cont.* 2.23.1, on voluptuary ascetics who regularly dine on costly meats and fish and claim that their stomachs are not hardy enough to handle common foods. Along similar lines Pliny the Elder is stupefied that people expend so much effort refining the art of wine-making so as to keep from drinking water, which is abundantly available in nature: *in nulla parte operosior vita est, ceu non saluberrimum ad potus aquae liquorem natura dederit, quo cetera omnia animantia utuntur ...* (*nat. hist.* 14.137).

## 12.2

*audio praeterea quosdam* For the sense of the verb here, see on 6.4 *audio*, and on the insinuating *quosdam*, see above on 5.5 *scio quosdam ... adtendis*.

*contra rerum hominumque naturam* A Ciceronian turn of phrase; cf. *Rosc.* 45 *contra rerum naturam contraque consuetudinem hominum contraque opinioniones omnium*.

*sorbitiunculas delicatas* The rare diminutive *sorbitiuncula* (cf. *sorbitio*) means ‘food prepared in a liquid or semi-liquid form’ (*OLD* sv *sorbitiuncula*). It appears to be attested, in Latin literature pre-dating the fifth century, only in Jer. (*adv. Iov.* 2.5, v. *Hilar.* 5.6, *epist.* 77.6.2, *Vulg.* 2Sam. 13:6, 8, 10). M. Prendergast, *The Latinity of the De vita contemplativa of Julianus Pomerius* (Washington, 1938), 164, surmises that Jer. was the one to introduce this word into late Latin idiom, but this judgment is of course too hasty. In any event, it also occurs once in Ps.-Jerome’s *Disputatio de sollemnibus paschae* 6 (printed in Hilberg’s critical edition of the Hieronymian correspondence as *Epistula* 149), but this treatise may be the product of the seventh century, according to D. Ó. Cróinín, “The Computistical Works of Columbanus,” in M. Lapidge (ed.), *Columbanus: Studies on the Latin Writings* (Woodbridge, 1997), 264–270 (267–268).

The unusual phrase *sorbitiunculas delicatas*, attested only in Jer. prior to the turn of the fifth century, was taken over a few generations later by Julian Pomerius, who used it in his condemnation of neo-Manichaean ascetics (so A. Dufourcq, *Étude sur les Gesta martyrum romains*, 4: *le néo-Manichéisme et la légende chrétienne* [Paris, 1910], 52–53) who abstain from animal products yet gorge themselves on exotic fruits, dainty purées, and other such fare: *peregrinis pomis ac sorbitiunculis delicatis caeterisque aliis cibis* (v. *cont.* 2.23.1); cf. *Aug. mor. eccl. cath.* 31.67 *videas enim quosdam pro usitato vino inusitatos liquores exquirere et aliorum expressione pomorum, quod ex uva sibi denegant, multo suavius compensare, serm.* 207.2, 210.8.10. Needless to say, Julian’s appropriation of this phrase, otherwise unattested outside Jer. and himself, is a precious piece of evidence for his reading of the letter to Nepotian.

*non calice sorbere sed conca* E. Courtney, “The Interpolations in Juvenal,” *BICS* 22 (1975): 147–162 (162n4), notes the similarity between the scholiast’s gloss of Juvenal’s *bibitur conchā* (6.304) as *non calicibus* and Jer.’s phraseology (the resemblance had previously been recorded by H. Spelthahn in *TLL* IV 28.58 ff.) and he plausibly suggests that Jer. read the scholia on Juvenal. For this imperial satirist’s popularity during the late Empire, see G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist* (Oxford, 1962), 180–190.

*sorbitiunculas ... sorbere* The etymological stem-repetition here would have qualified this construction as a type of pleonasm in the eyes of most ancient rhetorical theoreticians (cf. Lausberg, § 503). Iulius Rufinianus (*de schem. lex.* 40) provides some examples: *figura per pleonasmon, ut ... vivere vitam et pugnare pugnam, et ire iter ... et voce vocans Hecaten*. For salient

examples from a Christian text contemporaneous with the letter to Nepotian, see the Greek *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* (cf. Cain 2012): prol. 5 βίον βιοῦντας, 1.63 ὕμνοις ὕμνων τὸν θεόν, 10.25 γράμμασι γεγραμμένον.

*pro pudor!* This exclamation first became fashionable in the literature of the Neronian period, in which it is used usually in political contexts; see A. Kershaw, “A Neronian Exclamatory Phrase,” *CQ* n.s. 41 (1991): 559–560. It is very sparsely attested (e.g. Flor. *epit. Tit. Liv.* 1.11.9; Tert. *nat.* 2.11) until the fourth and fifth centuries, when it regained a vestige of its previous popularity among Christian authors (e.g. Prudent. *perist.* 5.129, *Psych.* 353; Oros. *hist. adv. pag.* 5.22.5). Jer. employs the expression three other times in his correspondence (*epist.* 53.7.1, 60.17.3, 122.4.3).

*non erubescimus istiusmodi ineptiis* The case of *ineptiis* has been contested by scholars: in *TLL* V 1 vi.822.16 ff. the abl. is assumed, but Goelzer, 313, remains undecided between the dat. and abl. In the literary Latin of the classical period the obj. of *erubescere* normally is in the abl. (= abl. of cause), frequently following the preposition *in*. In late Latin, however, these strictures were relaxed, such that the obj. could now take not only the abl. but also the dat. (cf. *TLL* V 1 vi.822.18 ff.), acc. (cf. *TLL* V 1 vi.821.59 ff.), and, on the rarest of occasions, even the gen. (cf. *TLL* V 1 vi.822.31 ff.). Jer.’s own usage reflects this latitude. In his prose *erubescere* may take a preposition: e.g. *a* + abl. (e.g. *commentariol. in Ps.* 6 l. 56 *erubescant a peccatis suis*), *ad* + acc. (e.g. *dial. c. Pel.* 2.12 *ut erubescas ad sententiam tuam*), *in* + abl. (e.g. *adv. Iov.* 1.37 *in quibus nunc erubescitis*), and *de* + abl. (e.g. *apol. c. Ruf.* 1.10 *nec erubescas de commutatione sententiae*; cf. Paul. Nol. *epist.* 32.9 *de meis ineptiis erubescas*). Or, unaccompanied by prepositional constructions, *erubescere* may take the obj. in the acc. (e.g. *epist.* 52.5.7 *ineptias ... delicias et lepores ... urbanitates ... erubescimus*, c. *Vig.* 12 *non erubesco earum fidem*), and even the gen. the lone occurrence of which is at *epist.* 22.7.3 *non erubesco infelicitatis meae* (in this case proper classical usage would require *de* + abl.; Jer. is not writing defective Latin—rather, there appears to be an interference between the genitive of respect and the classical construction with *de*; see G. Haverling, “On Cases and Prepositions in Vulgar and Literary Late Latin,” in C. Arias Abellán [ed.], *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif*, VII [Seville, 2006], 345–360 [357]). Interestingly, there is not a single place in Jer.’s extant writings in which *erubescere* unambiguously takes its obj. in the dat. As far as the present passage in the letter to Nepotian is concerned, this fact need not tip the scale in favor of *ineptiis* being abl. (after all, a Hieronymian proof-text for the dat. may simply not have survived). Moreover, the great variety in Jer.’s

own usage precludes a definitive verdict for the case of *ineptiis* (i.e. either dat. or abl.).

*nec taedet superstitionis* See above on 12.1 *non superstitiosa*.

*famam abstinentiae in deliciis quaerimus* Cf. *epist.* 54.10.4 *nonnulli vitam pudicam adpetentium in medio itinere corruunt, dum solam abstinentiam carniū putant et leguminibus onerant stomachum, quae moderate parceque sumpta innoxia sunt*, 108.17.3 [*Paula*] *exceptis festis diebus vix oleum in cibo acceperit, ut ex hoc uno aestimetur quid de vino et liquamine et piscibus et lacte ac melle et ovis et reliquis quae gustu suavia sunt iudicarit. in quibus sumendis quidam se abstinentissimos putant et si his ventrem ingurgitaverint tutam pudicitiam suspicantur.*

*fortissimum ieiunium est aqua et panis* Bread, usually seasoned with salt, was a popular dish among ascetics in general (see e.g. *apoph. patr.* Helladius 2, Iohannes 29 [PG 65:172, 213]; Theod. *hist. rel.* 2.13, 20.3), and Gregory of Nazianzus (*orat.* 43.61) claims that it was Basil's favorite meal. Jer.'s Roman friend Asella subsisted happily on a strict diet of water and salted bread (*epist.* 24.3.1), as did the monk Julian (Theod. *hist. rel.* 2.2). On bread and water as staples of the stereotypical ascetic diet, see further Bas. *epist.* 2.6; John Chrys. *hom. in Mt.* 69.3 (PG 58:653); Aug. *mor. eccl. cath.* 31.66; Theod. *hist. rel.* 3.3, 11.1, 12.3, 17.6, 20.3.

*quasi publicum et commune ieiunium non putatur* Jer. has borrowed a phrase from Tertullian (*orat.* 18 *sic et die paschae, quo communis et quasi publica ieiunii religio est*). On his literary indebtedness to the North African Father, see Cain 2009d.

## Chapter 13

Nepotian is told to disregard what people may say about him and to focus on pleasing God rather than his fellow man. Equipped with this singular mindset, he will be able to brave any adversity like a good soldier of Christ. Since he is not to fret over how others perceive him, he should not be like the Pharisees (Jer.'s coded imagery for sham Christian priests) and parade his religiosity. Rather, the authentic piety which he is to cultivate must come from within, and its ethical focal point should be the four cardinal virtues, which Jer. picturesquely likens alternately to the four quadrants of the sky, a four-horse chariot, a precious gem-studded necklace, and an impenetrable shield.

## 13.1

*cave ne hominum rumusculos aucuperis* A Ciceronian turn of phrase; see *Cluent.* 105 *tum etiam illi quinque qui imperitorum hominum rumusculos aucupati, leg. 3.35 L. Cassio ... omnes rumusculos populari ratione aucupante.* Jer.'s *hominum rumusculos aucuperis* most immediately recalls the first of these passages (*hominum rumusculos aucupati*).

The diminutive *rumusculus* is found one other time in Cicero (*epist. ad Att.* 2.5.1 *quas quidem ego multo magis vereor quam eorum hominum qui hodie vivunt rumusculos*), but it seems to have lost its literary currency for much of the imperial period, for it is not attested again until the late fourth century: once each in Rufinus (*apol. c. Hier.* 1.3) and Ammianus Marcellinus (26.6.6), and seven other times in Jer. (*comm. in Is.* lib. 14, praef. ll. 16–17, *comm. in Tit.* 3.9 l. 261, *alt. Luc. et orth.* 15, *epist.* 51.3.3, 58.6.2, 66.9.3, 105.2.1). The *OLD* defines *rumusculus* as 'a piece of petty gossip or scandal'. However, in the present passage the plural of this word means 'adulation' or the like, and this is its sense elsewhere in Jer., as is evident from its juxtaposition by synonyms like *gloria*, *gloriola*, and *laus* (e.g. *comm. in Is.* lib. 14, praef. ll. 16–17 *hominum famam atque rumusculos*, *alt. Luc. et orth.* 15 *ut nihil ob gloriae cupiditatem, nihil ob hominum rumusculos faciat*, *epist.* 58.6.2 *rumusculos et gloriolas et palpantes adulatorem quasi hostes fuge*, 105.2.1 *laudem atque rumusculos et gloriolam populi*). That this is Jer.'s intended meaning for the word in *Epistula* 52 is confirmed by the context: he proceeds to develop the principle that the soldier of Christ should put no stock whatsoever in what people say about him, be it good or bad.

*ne offensam dei populorum laude commutes* An elegant chiasmic antithesis. For the antithesis between popular praise and God's disfavor, cf. *comm. in Is.* lib. 14, praef. ll. 16–17. See also Jer's praise of Paula: *maluit inimicitias hominum subire perpetuas quam dei offensam amicitiiis noxiis provocare* (*epist.* 108.25.4).

Although *commutare* and its root *mutare* can employ the accusative both for the thing given in exchange and the thing received (see e.g. C. Beck, *Syntax of the Latin Language* [Boston, 1844], 53–54), the far more common construction is the accusative for the thing given in exchange (*offensam*) and the ablative for the thing received (*laude*). Jer's documented preference for the more traditional accusative-ablative formulation (cf. e.g. *epist.* 97.2.3, 107.3.2, 108.15.4, 122.3.4) is reflected here.

*“si adhuc,” inquit apostolus, “hominibus placerem, Christi servus non essem.” desivit placere hominibus et servus factus est Christi* Jer. quotes Gal. 1:10 in connection with the monastic vocation also at *epist.* 31.3.3, 66.6.1 (*prima virtus est monachi contemnere hominum iudicia et semper apostoli recordari dicentis ...*). For Paul as ‘the Apostle’, see n. on 4.2 *apostolum*. Gregory the Great (*reg. past.* 2.8) also quotes this verse in the context of instructing his clerical readers on the issue at hand, but his lengthier discussion is more nuanced than Jer's in that Gregory draws a useful distinction between people-pleasing out of sinful and holy motives. Regarding the latter, he says that the priest should strive to cultivate the goodwill of his congregation so that they will be more likely to lend a willing ear to his pastoral exhortation.

*per bonam et malam famam, a dextris et a sinistris Christi miles graditur* This passage has been inspired by two different Pauline texts, 2 Tim. 2:3 (*labora sicut bonus miles Christi Iesu*) and 2 Cor. 6:7b–8a ([*ministri dei*] *per arma iustitiae a dextris et sinistris ... per infamiam et bonam famam*); Jer's choice of *graditur* was dictated not by biblical usage but by this verb's militaristic connotation (cf. *TLL* VI 2 xi.2139.71 ff.). Jer. omits *per arma iustitiae*, which in Paul goes with *a dextris et a sinistris*: by διὰ τῶν ὀπλῶν τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν (*per arma iustitiae a dextris et sinistris*) Paul means “by the weapons of righteousness for the right hand and the left”; see M.J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, 2005), 477–478. By expunging the phrase in question Jer. forces *a dextris et a sinistris*, along with *per bonam et malam famam* with which it is parallel, to be taken directly with *graditur*. This omission notwithstanding, Jer. effectively evokes the *militia Christi* imagery that he



applies often to asceticism (see on 5.3 *ne ... militia*). Almost ten years earlier, in a letter to Asella penned on the cusp of his departure from Rome in which he defended himself against accusations of legacy-hunting and sexual impropriety (cf. Cain 2009a, 114–128), Jer. had brilliantly identified with Paul in applying 2 Cor. 8a to himself; see *epist.* 45.6.3 *infamiam falsi criminis inportarunt, sed scio per bonam et malam famam perveniri ad regna caelorum*. At *reg. past.* 2.3 Gregory the Great also quotes 2 Cor. 6:7b–8a, and like Jer. does here, he follows it with a quasi-Stoic encomium of the ideal priest's fortitude.

*nec laude extollitur nec vituperatione frangitur, non divitiis tumet non contrahitur paupertate, et laeta contemnit et tristia* Cf. *comm. in Is.* 3.12 ll. 32–34 *spernentes hominum iudicia nec laudibus eorum extollamur nec obtretationibus contristemur, sed ingrediamur rectam viam et tritas a sanctis prophetis semitas*. Julian Pomerius describes in similar terms the even-keeled spiritual disposition of the practitioner of the *vita contemplativa*: *ne aut metus amittendae rei temporalis aut cupiditas acquirendae intentionem mentis eius emolliat. non eum blanda corrumpant, nec adversa concutiant; non inflet opinio secunda, nec sinistra deiciat, nec falsa vituperatio sive laudatio augeat gaudia eius aut minuat; non gaudeat de temporalibus omnino nec lugeat. inter laeta invictus ac tristia unam faciem animi constantis obtineat* (*v. cont.* 1.8.1); cf. John Cass. *inst.* 9.13. For this sentiment in secular literature, see e.g. Liv. *a.u.c.* 45.8.7 *is demum vir erit cuius animum neque prosperae res flatu suo efferent nec adversae infringent*.

The first of these three successive antitheses is notable for its anaphora (*nec ... nec*) and homoioteleuton, the second for its chiasmus and anaphora (*non ... non*), and the third for its hyperbaton and overall compactness, bringing the period to a pithy and compelling close. In his articulation of the soldier of Christ's imperviousness to the fluctuations of the human condition Jer. has been influenced by the Stoic ideal of the unmovable *sapiens* (cf. e.g. Sen. *epist.* 66.6, *tranqu. anim.* 2.3–4); for some of the Stoic elements of Jer.'s thought, see A. Canellis, "Saint Jérôme et les passions: sur les *quattuor perturbationes* des Tusculanes," *REAug* 54 (2000): 178–203. Cf. Sulpicius Severus' description of St. Martin's constancy: *nemo umquam illum vidit iratum, nemo commotum, nemo maerentem, nemo ridentem; unus idemque fuit semper* (*v. Mart.* 27.1).

*per diem sol non uret eum neque luna per noctem* Jer. interprets Ps. 119:6 LXX, which he quotes here verbatim without introducing it as a biblical text, as a promise that God will watch over the righteous in both prosperity and

adversity also at *commentariol. in Ps. 120:6* ll. 1–3, *comm. in Is. 5:5* ll. 12–14, 26.7–9 ll. 31–35, 49.8–13 ll. 51–55, 66.20 ll. 72–74.

### 13.2

*nolo te ... nolo te* This anaphora succinctly captures the essence of the role-play in *Epistula* 52: Jer. is the magisterial advisor (*nolo*) and Nepotian is the recipient of the exhortation (*te*). The reiteration strengthens the delivery of the precepts contained in the two successive sentences and it also imposes a sense of orderliness through similarity of construction, closely connecting syntactically sentences which are bound together thematically in that they both contain allusions to Christ's censures of Pharisaical hypocrisy. Jer. makes impressive use of the anaphoric *nolo* in other paraenetic situations in his correspondence; cf. *epist.* 14.1.2 *nolo pristinarum necessitatum recorderis—nudos amat heremus—, nolo te antiquae peregrinationis terreat difficultas*, 22.16.1 *nolo habeas consortia matronarum, nolo ad nobilium accedas domos, nolo te frequenter videre, quod contemnens virgo esse voluisti*, 22.25.2 *nolo te sponsum quaerere per plateas, nolo circumire angulos civitatis*. Slightly later in the letter to Nepotian he stylishly begins the section on clerical house-calls with twofold anaphora (see on 15.1 *officii tui est ... officii ergo tui est*).

*nolo te orare in angulis platearum* An allusion to Mt. 6:5, where Christ warns his followers not to be ostentatious like the Pharisees when they pray: *et cum oratis non eritis sicut hypocritae qui amant in synagogis et in angulis platearum stantes orare ut videantur ab hominibus*. Elsewhere Jer. maps this verse onto heretics (*comm. in Zach. 14.10–11* ll. 415–417), but here he applies it to clergymen who are not practicing ascetics, and perhaps especially to those who are vocal in their opposition to the kind of monastic code of conduct that he recommends to Nepotian. For Jer. this comparison of anti-ascetic churchmen to the biblical Pharisees was a familiar and intensely personal polemical typology: years earlier he had typecast his own critics within the Roman clerical establishment as Pharisees (see Cain 2006b). In his epistolary *epitaphium* on Nepotian Jer. commends the young priest for having embodied a prayerful piety that was decidedly anti-Pharisaical in that the focus was on pleasing God rather than men: *creber in orationibus, vigilans in precando, lacrimas deo non hominibus offerebat* (*epist.* 60.10.7). Gregory the Great (*reg. past.* 1.1) also likens haughty clerics to Pharisees (cf. *Greg. Naz. orat.* 2.70).

*aura popularis* A relatively common phrase found in Cicero (*harusp.* 43), Livy (3.33.7, 29.37.17, 30.45.6, 42.30.4), Horace (*carm.* 3.2.20), Virgil (*Aen.* 6.816), Quintilian (*inst. orat.* 11.1.45), Cyprian (*Don.* 11), and most of all Jer., who uses it eight other times, and always in a derogatory sense.

*nolo te dilatare fimbrias et ostentui habere phylacteria* Cf. Mt. 23:5b *dilatant enim phylacteria sua et magnificant fimbrias*. Augustine invokes the same biblical text when reproaching hypocritical monks at *op. mon.* 28.36. *ostentui habere* is a late Latin construction; it recurs five other times in Jer.'s works. On the various usages of the word 'phylactery' in ancient pagan and Christian literature, see G.J.M. Bartelink, "Φυλακτήριον-*phylacterium*," in *Mélanges Christine Mohrmann* (Utrecht, 1973), 25–60.

*conscientia repugnante* Jer. appears to be unique among Latin patristic authors in his usage of this expression, which he employs in the prologue to his translation of Esther (Weber, 638).

*melius est haec in corde portare quam in corpore* In 398, in his *Commentary on Matthew* (23.5 ll. 92–96), Jer. reused this striking parechetic (*corde ... corpore*) antithesis with the verb *portare*: *pictaciola illa decalogi phylacteria vocabant quod quicumque habuisset ea quasi ob custodiam et munimentum sui haberet, non intellegentibus Pharisaeis quod haec in corde portanda sint non in corpore*. In this same passage he goes on to unfavorably compare the Pharisees' phylacteries to the locket containing miniature copies of the Gospels (or fragments of the True Cross) that Christian *superstitiosae mulierculae* in his day wore as amulets; this practice is mentioned also by Chrysostom (*hom. in Mt.* 72.2 [PG 58:669]).

*habeto prudentiam, iustitiam, temperantiam, fortitudinem* Jer. establishes these four virtues as the reference point for Nepotian's clerical-monastic piety. Augustine likewise makes them the foundation of orthodox Catholic piety; see *mor. eccl. cath.* 1.35 *sed tempus est ad illas virtutes quatuor reverti et ex his singulis eruere ac ducere vivendi modum*, followed by a detailed discussion exploring the significance of each of these four virtues for the life of the Christian.

The first attempts to formulate a canon of cardinal virtues date back to the late archaic period in Greece and coincide with the rise of the Athenian polis; cf. O. Kunsemueller, *Die Herkunft der platonischen Kardinaltugenden* (Erlangen, 1935). In the fifth and fourth centuries BC numerous virtues were regarded as being essential for the welfare of the individual and of the city-

state (see D. Whitehead, "Cardinal Virtues: The Language of Public Approval in Democratic Athens," *C&M* 44 [1993]: 37–75). Plato was the first to codify the tetrad of φρόνησις/σοφία (*prudentia/sapientia*), δικαιοσύνη (*iustitia*), ἀνδρεία (*fortitudo*), and σωφροσύνη (*temperantia*) (in early Christian discourse σωφροσύνη often stood for 'chastity'; see H. North, "The Concept of *sophrosyne* in Greek Literary Criticism," *CPh* 43 [1948]: 1–17). This canon grew out of Plato's conception of the soul as a tripartite entity, with each part being governed by its own ἀρετή—the intellectual part by σοφία, the spirited faculty by ἀνδρεία, the appetitive part by σωφροσύνη (as self-restraint), while σωφροσύνη (as harmony) and δικαιοσύνη simultaneously operate in all three parts of the soul; cf. D. Carr, "The Cardinal Virtues and Plato's Moral Psychology," *PhQ* 39 (1988): 186–200. Beginning in the third century AD the Platonic tetrad of virtues, which had since been appropriated by the Stoics, was adapted by Christian thinkers to the moral economy of their religion. Jer., like Origen, the Cappadocians, Ambrose, and other patristic authors, found creative applications for them. Here they are the four quadrants of the sky and a spiritual four-horse chariot, and elsewhere the four rows of precious stones that adorn the high priest's breastplate (cf. Ex. 28:17) (*epist.* 64.20.3), the four animals of Ezek. 1:5 (*comm. in Hiez.* 1.1.6–8 ll. 277–280), and the four blacksmiths who destroy the four horns (= the vices) that wreak havoc on Israel (cf. Zech. 1:18–20) (*comm. in Zach.* 1.1.18–21 ll. 497–501); cf. J. Préaux, "Les quatre vertus païennes et chrétiennes: apothéose et ascension," in J. Bibauw (ed.), *Hommages à Marcel Renard* (2 vols., Brussels, 1969), 1.639–657. They also are the names of Christ (*comm. in Is.* 6.14.31–32 ll. 41–44) and they stand for individual ascetic friends in Jer.'s circle (*epist.* 66.3.1–2: Pammachius = *prudentia*; Paula = *iustitia*; Eustochium = *fortitudo*; Paulina = *temperantia*); cf. Hagendahl, 378–380. See more generally J. Ferguson, *Moral Values in the Ancient World* (London, 1958), 24–52; H. North, "Canons and Hierarchies of the Cardinal Virtues in Greek and Latin Literature," in L. Wallach (ed.), *The Classical Tradition* (Ithaca, 1966), 165–183; J. Pieper, *Das Viergespann: Klugheit, Gerechtigkeit, Tapferkeit, Mass* (Munich, 1964).

### 13.3

*haec te quadriga velut aurigam Christi ad metam concitum ferat* Chariot-racing was an immensely popular sport, and indeed a veritable cultural institution, in the late Roman period and especially during the fourth century (see J. Humphrey, *Roman Circuses: Arenas for Chariot Racing* [Berkeley, 1986], 579–638). Even though Jer. personally objected to this form of

public spectacle, he here appropriates hippodrome imagery, calculated to resonate with his contemporary readership, in an attempt to shower the monastic clergyman with spiritual prestige and accolades comparable to those enjoyed in the secular realm by charioteers, who were generally hailed as the greatest sports idols of their time (cf. A. Cameron, *Porphyrius the Charioteer* [Oxford, 1973], 244–252; R. van Dam, “Hagiography and History: The Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus,” *CA* 1 [1982]: 272–308 [306], likewise notes that they were “the headliners of society”). He had an immense liking for charioteer metaphors and deployed them in numerous other contexts: God is the *auriga* of the chariot of the universe (*epist.* 64.21.2); the Holy Spirit is the *auriga* who guided the creation of the world (*epist.* 69.6.1); the Lord sits atop his cherubim like an *auriga* (*tract. in Ps.* 67 ll. 107–108, *comm. in Is.* 3.6.2–3 ll. 18–19, *comm. in Hiez.* 1.1.6–8 l. 301, *comm. in Os.* 3.12.9–10 ll. 229–230); the soul is the *auriga* that holds in check the passions (*adv. Iov.* 2.10; cf. *comm. in Zach.* 10.6–7 ll. 169–171); Nepotian mastered his fasting regimen like a skilled *auriga* (*epist.* 60.10.7; cf. 107.10.3); Christ is the *auriga* of the Christian’s soul (*comm. in Am.* 6.12–15 l. 477, *comm. in Abac.* 2.3.10–13 ll. 893–895) as well as of the chariot pulled by Paula, Eustochium, Paulina, and Pammachius, each of whom is likened to one of the four cardinal virtues (*epist.* 66.2.2–3.1). On Christ as the divine charioteer, a common theme in patristic literature, see J.W. Smit, “The Triumphant Horseman Christ,” in *Mélanges Christine Mohrmann* (Utrecht, 1973), 172–190. Cf. Greg. Nys. *anim. et resurr.* (PG 46:12): like a seasoned equestrian Macrina bridled and steered her grieving brother Gregory in his emotional turmoil.

The hippodrome imagery in the letter to Nepotian is reminiscent of Plato’s, whereby the charioteer driving his vehicle is an allegory for the soul steering the body (*Tim.* 69c; cf. *Crit.* 109c, *Phaedr.* 246a); cf. G.R.F. Ferrari, “The Struggle in the Soul. Plato, *Phaedrus* 253c7–255a1,” *AncPhil* 5 (1985): 1–10; S. Slaveva-Griffin, “Of Gods, Philosophers, and Charioteers: Content and Form in Parmenides’ Proem and Plato’s *Phaedrus*,” *TAPhA* 133 (2003): 227–253. Jer. accesses this notion at *adv. Iov.* 2.10 (cited above), as does Augustine in *serm.* 223A (*Miscellanea Agostiniana* [Rome, 1930], 1.15): *tu certe vivis: habes corpus, habes animum: visibile est corpus, invisibilis est animus: corpus habitaculum, animus habitator: corpus vehiculum, animus utens vehiculo: corpus quasi vehiculum quod regatur, animus auriga corporis tui*. And Basil of Seleucia: τῷ δὲ κρατοῦντι λογισμῷ τὰς τοῦ σώματος ἡνίας ἐπέτρεψεν· καὶ καθάπερ ἄρματι τῷ σώματι τὴν ψυχὴν ἡνίοχον ἐπιστήσας, τὸν δρόμον τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐλαύνειν παρακελεύεται (PG 85:52). Cf. also Chrysostom’s rebuke of members of his congregation who skipped church on Good Friday to attend the chariot races: εἰ δὲ ἐβούλου δρόμον ἀλόγων ὁρᾶν, τίνος ἔνεκεν οὐκ ἔξευξας τὰ

ἄλογα ἐν σοὶ πάθη, θυμὸν καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν, καὶ ἐπέθηκας αὐτοῖς τὸν τῆς φιλοσοφίας ζυγὸν, τὸν χρηστὸν καὶ κοῦφον, καὶ ἐπέστησας αὐτοῖς λογισμὸν ὀρθὸν, καὶ πρὸς τὸ βραβεῖον ἤλασας τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως, οὐκ ἀπὸ μύσους εἰς μύσος, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ γῆς εἰς οὐρανὸν τρέχων; τοῦτο γὰρ τῆς ἵπποδρομίας τὸ εἶδος μετὰ τῆς ἡδονῆς πολλὴν ἔχει τὴν ὠφέλειαν (*c. lud. et theat.* 1 [PG 56:265]). In Origen, *Hier. cat.* fr. 40 it is the demons who commandeer chariots of vices which oppose the traditional quartet of virtues: ἀναβάται ἵππων οἱ δαίμονες οἱ ταῖς σαρκικαῖς ἡδοναῖς ἐπικαθήμενοι· καὶ πάλαι γὰρ τῆς Αἰγύπτου “ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην ἔρριψεν εἰς θάλασσαν”, οὗτοι δὲ ζευγνύντες ἐν ἡμῖν διάφορα πάθη, ταῖς τέτρασιν ἀρεταῖς ἀντικείμενα, κατασκευάζουσιν ἄρματα. Moreover, in his implementation of the hippodrome metaphor for the Christian's interior struggle against sin Jer. is operating well within the parameters of a longstanding literary tradition, yet by the same token he appears to be the only patristic author to speak of the clergyman as “Christ's charioteer”.

*nihil hoc monili pretiosius, nihil hac gemmarum varietate distinctius* With this bicolon crescens (syllabic ratio of 11:15) richly decorated by homoioteleuton, anaphora, asyndeton, and *disiunctio*, Jer. now introduces a gemological metaphor whereby to conceptualize the beauty and potency of the four cardinal virtues in the economy of ascetic ethics.

In the Roman world fine jewelry was an important status symbol associated with socio-economic *nobilitas*; see A.M. Stout, “Jewelry as a Symbol of Status in the Roman Empire,” in J.L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante (eds.), *The World of Roman Costume* (Madison, 1994), 77–100. Thus, when Jer. and other Christian authors referred to exceptionally holy people as precious jewelry (e.g. Jer. *epist.* 46.10.2, 66.1.2, 66.7.1, 77.9.1, 107.13.1, 108.3.4, 108.4.2, *adv. Iov.* 1.34; Greg. Elv. *comm. in Cant.* 2.35; Paul. Nol. *epist.* 13.28; Anon. v. *Hil. Arel.* 2), they were transferring the status symbolism of secular society to the spiritual sphere. Individual virtues also were often likened to lustrous gems (e.g. Jer. *epist.* 64.22.1; Paul. Nol. *carm.* 21.75; Prudent. *Psych.* 911; Aug. *enarr. in Ps.* 33 2.15; cf. Jer. *epist.* 79.7.7 *ieiunium, pallor et sordes gemmae tuae sint*) that give the pious soul an iridescent glow; undergirding this imagery of the virtues generating radiance for the soul is the late antique belief that jewels do not reflect light but actually emit it from within; cf. G. de Nie, “The Poet as Visionary: Venantius Fortunatus's New Mantle for Saint Martin,” *Cassiodorus* 3 (1987): 49–83 (65–70).

The locution *gemmarum varietate distinctius* is distinctly Hieronymian. See *comm. in Is.* 17.60.13–14 l. 26 *ubi portae duodecim gemmarum varietate distinctae?*; *comm. in Ioel.* 3.7–8 ll. 170–171 *portas gemmarum varietate distinctas*, *comm. in Zach.* 2.8 ll. 169–170 *divinos libros ... gemmarum varietate*

*distinctos*; cf. *comm. in Is.* 17.62.1–3 ll. 49–50 *quod martyres gemmarum suarum varietate distinxerint*.

*et ornamento tibi sunt et munimini* Hilberg printed *tutamini* instead of *munimini*, though he neglected to note in which MS(S) his chosen reading is attested. I have opted for *munimini*, which is found in *Σ*, *D*, *k*, and *B*. This emendation accommodates Jer.'s own preference in diction: *tutamen* recurs only two other times in his works, and *munimen*, sixteen times.

*gemmae vertuntur in scuta* This pithy finisher, whereby Jer. violates the promise he had made at 4.1 (*ne a me quaeras ... per fines capitum singulorum acuta quaedam breviterque conclusa*), looks back to the martial imagery near the beginning of the chapter (*Christi miles*) and thus it adds structural symmetry in the way of a ring composition. Jer. likens the four cardinal virtues (see above) to spiritual shields also at *comm. in Naum* 3.1–4 ll. 110–113 where they are said to deflect Satan's arrows, i.e. *stultitia*, *iniquitas*, *luxuria*, and *formido*. At *comm. in Is.* 15.55.12–13 ll. 46–47 he likewise names, as the antitheses of the virtues, *iniquitas* (*iustitia*), *temeritas* (*fortitudo*), *luxuria* (*temperantia*), and *stultitia* (*prudentia*). He opposes them to the four Stoic *perturbationes* at *comm. in Hiez.* 1.1.6–8 ll. 277–279.

## Chapter 14

Jer. sternly warns Nepotian to neither slander nor tolerate anyone being slandered in his presence. This is a topic about which Jer. himself was particularly sensitive: throughout his writings he repeatedly voices his frustration with being the target of detraction (e.g. *epist.* 45.2.1, 49.12.2, 50.1.2, 60.16.1, *comm. in Os.* lib. 1, prol. ll. 142–150). He later reworked the material in this chapter and incorporated it into his *Epistula* 125 (§19) to the Gallic monk Rusticus.

## 14.1

*cave quoque ne aut linguam aut aures habeas prurientes* Hilberg missed this faint allusion to 2 Tim. 4:3 *erit enim tempus cum sanam doctrinam non sustinebunt, sed ad sua desideria coacervabunt sibi magistros prurientes auribus*. Some two decades later Jer. drew inspiration from the same biblical verse, but more immediately from his own letter to Nepotian, when he warned Rusticus about the dangers of calumny: *haec expressius loquor, ut adulescentem meum et linguae et aurium prurigine liberem* (*epist.* 125.20.1). In his coupling, in both of these passages, of the ears and tongue with reference to this Pauline verse Jer. would appear to be following the lead of Gregory of Nazianzus, who alludes to the same biblical text when censuring the Eunomians for their unhealthy appetite for false doctrine: εἰσὶ γάρ, εἰσὶ τινες, οἱ τὴν ἀκοὴν προσκνῶμενοι καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν, ἥδη δέ, ὡς ὁρῶ, καὶ τὴν χεῖρα, τοῖς ἡμετέροις λόγοις, καὶ χαίροντες ταῖς βεβήλοις κενοφωνίαις, καὶ ἀντιθέσει τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, καὶ ταῖς εἰς οὐδὲν χρήσιμον φερούσαις λογομαχίαις (*orat.* 27.1); on Jer.'s appropriation of Gregorian phraseology, see on 5.7 *quorum ... sacerdotio*. Both Paul and Gregory used the metaphor of itching ears to castigate some people's craving for erroneous doctrinal novelties. Clement of Alexandria had applied the Pauline metaphor to sophistic teachers who assail the truth of the Gospel and lead astray the gullible: κνήθοντες καὶ γαργαλίζοντες οὐκ ἀνδρικῶς, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, τὰς ἀκοὰς τῶν κνήσασθαι γλιχομένων (*strom.* 1.3.23.3). Jer., however, transfers the metaphor from an intellectual-doctrinal context to the social-interpersonal realm, applying it to gossip.

*quoque* This adverb implies an antecedent to the current round of admonitions introduced by *cave*. It does in fact look back to the opening of the previous thematic section (13.1 *cave ne hominum rumusculos aucupe- ris*).



*ne aut ipse aliis detrahas aut alios audias detrahentes. "sedens," inquit, "adversus fratrem tuum loquebaris et adversus filium matris tuae ponebas scandalum; haec fecisti et tacui. existimasti iniquitatem quod ero tibi similis; arguam te et statuam contra faciem tuam"* This passage begins with an apparent allusion to Jas. 4:11a (*nolite detrahare de alterutrum*), which Hilberg failed to note. It is followed by a quotation of Ps. 49:20–21 translated *iuxta* LXX. At *epist.* 125.19.1 Jer. also quotes Ps. 49:20, prefacing it with the stern admonition: *numquam ergo tales videas nec huiusce modi hominibus adplice-ris, ne declines cor tuum in verba malitiae et audias*. On the evils of slander, cf. e.g. Orig. *hom.* 2 in Ps. 37 2; *apoph. patr.* Iohannes 15, Hierax 1, Moyses 18, and Or 15 (PG 65:208–209, 232, 288, 440).

At *epist. ex. coll.* 14.43 Ambrose writes: *nolite audire detrahentes de proximis ne dum auditis alios provocemini ut et ipsi derogetis proximis et dicatur unicuique vestrum: "sedens adversus fratrem tuum detrahebas"*. In view of the similar wording of the injunctions and the appeal to Ps. 49:20 it is possible that this Ambrosian passage has been influenced by the letter to Nepotian. Indeed, as D.G. Hunter, "The Raven Replies: Ambrose's Letter to the Church at Vercelli (*Ep.ex.coll.* 14) and the Criticisms of Jerome," in Cain-Lössl, 175–190, shows, in this particular letter Ambrose allusively responds to allegations that Jer. recently had levelled against him in *epist.* 69. Thus, at least one Hieronymian writing was before the eyes of the bishop of Milan as he penned his letter to the church at Vercelli. The letter to Nepotian may have been in his hands as well at that time or at some earlier point, but at any rate it can be safely assumed that if Ambrose had ever had the opportunity to read *Epistula* 52, he would have read it closely and with great interest, not least because he had once authored his own compendium on clerical *officia*.

*inquit* This verb occurs five other times in the letter to Nepotian, and on each occasion Jer. furnishes it with a personal subject: *dominus noster* (3.9), *pontifex* (implied subject; 7.2), *Domitius* (7.3), *Paulus apostolus* (7.5), and *apostolus* (13.1). Here, however, it is used impersonally (cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, 417–418).

*subauditur* An extremely common verbal form in patristic Latin—Jer. alone uses it on some ninety other occasions—which introduces a clarification of a given point, e.g. explanation of an etymological derivation or, as in the present case, gloss of a biblical passage.

*sermone tuos et cuncta* These accusatives are the direct object of *statuam* (from the biblical text just quoted), which in its original context is lacking

a proper object. Jer.'s Vulgate rendering of the Hebrew is more precise in that the synonymous verb does have a direct object (*proponam te ante oculos tuos*).

*quae de aliis es locutus ut tua sententia iudicaris in his ipse deprehensus quae in aliis arguebas* Cf. Ambr. *expl. Ps. 1 53.2 propheta rogat, ne intret dominus in iudicium cum servo suo; quanto magis nos iudicium domini timere debemus! pone, quia misericors dominus ignoscet; quanta prodentur, quae latere credebam! qui pudor, quae confusio erit, cum, qui alios profitebar docere, ipse in eo deprehendar in quo alios arguebam!* See also Cic. *Verr. 2.3.4*; Jer. *epist. 125.18.1 nulli detrahas nec in eo te sanctum putes, si ceteros laceres. accusamus saepe, quod facimus, et contra nosmet ipsos deserti in nostra vitia invehimur muti de eloquentibus iudicantes.*

#### 14.2

*neque vero illa iusta est excusatio: "referentibus aliis iniuriam facere non possum". nemo invito auditori libenter refert. sagitta in lapide numquam figitur, interdum resiliens percutit dirigentem. discat detractor, dum te viderit non libenter audire, non facile detrahere: "cum detractoribus", ait Salomon, "ne miscearis quoniam repente veniet perditio eorum et ruinam utriusque quis novit?" tam videlicet eius qui detrahit quam illius qui aurem adcommodat detractanti* Jer. later pursued this same line of argumentation in his letter to Rusticus but amplified its content, primarily in the way of adding more biblical proof-texts, while in the letter to Nepotian he quotes only Prov. 24:21–22. See *epist. 125.19.2–4 sed dicis: "ipse non detraho, aliis loquentibus facere quid possum?" ad excusandas excusationes in peccatis ista praetendimus. Christus arte non luditur. nequaquam mea, sed apostoli sententia est: "nolite errare; deus non inridetur". ille in corde, nos videmus in facie. Salomon loquitur in Proverbiis: "ventus aquilo dissipat nubes et vultus tristis linguas detrahentium". sicut enim sagitta, si mittatur contra duram materiam, nonnumquam in mittemtem reuertitur et vulnerat vulnerantem illudque completur: "facti sunt mihi in arcum pravum", et alibi: "qui mittit in altum lapidem, recidet in caput eius", ita detractor, cum tristem faciem viderit audientis, immo ne audientis quidem, sed obturantis aures suas, ne audiat iudicium sanguinis, ilico conticescit, pallet vultus, haerent labia, saliva siccatur. unde idem vir sapiens: "cum detractoribus," inquit, "non commiscearis, quoniam repente veniet perditio eorum; et ruinam utriusque quis novit?" tam scilicet eius, qui loquitur, quam illius, qui audit loquentem.*

*nemo invito auditori libenter refert* For the motif of the unwilling listener in Latin literature, see e.g. Plaut. *Bacch.* 212; Cic. *Quinct.* 39, *epist. ad Att.* 13.23.3, *epist. ad fam.* 4.1.2; Sen. *epist.* 58.35; Plin. *min. epist.* 7.24.8.

*sagitta in lapide numquam figitur, interdum resiliens percutit dirigentem* Jer. was partial to this metaphor of the arrow bouncing off the stone and returning to its shooter; cf. *tract. in Ps.* 93 ll. 40–41 *si sagittam dirigas in lapidem, et lapis durus fuerit, non solum non infigitur, sed resilit; epist.* 125.19.3 *sicut enim sagitta, si mittatur contra duram materiam, nonnumquam in mittentem revertitur et vulnerat vulnerantem ...* He was by no means the originator of this notion. Cf. e.g. the following anonymous Greek epigram about a man who throws a stone at a skull and is then blinded by it: κρανίον ἐν τριόδοισι κατοικημένον τις ἐσαθρῶν / εἰκόνα τὴν κοινὴν οὐκ ἐδάκρυσε βίου· / δεξιτερὴν δ' ἔρριψεν ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ λίθον ἤκεν / κωφὸν μὲν δοκέοντ', ἀλλὰ πνέοντα δίκης. / ὅστέον ὡς γὰρ ἐπληξεν, ἀφήλατο καὶ τὸν ἀφέντα / πῆρωσεν γλυκεροῦ βλέμματος ὀρφανίσας. / †καὶ πάλιν εἰς αἰδὴν κωλάζετο†, τὴν ἰδίην δὲ / ἔκλαυσεν χειρῶν εὖστοχον ἀφροσύνην (D.L. Page [ed.], *Further Greek Epigrams* [Cambridge, 1981], 367); cf. Aus. *epigr.* 76. For the same recoil imagery without the aggressor being struck, cf. Sen. *epist.* 102.7 *in nos nostra tela mittuntur*; Anon. *anth. Gr.* 10.111 ὁ φθόνος αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐοῖς βελέεσσι δαμάζει; Greg. Naz. *orat.* 43.47 ὡς γὰρ βέλος ἰσχυροτέρῳ προσπεσὼν ἀπεκρούσθη ... τοιοῦτῳ τῷ προστάτῃ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐνέτυχε καὶ τοσοῦτῳ προβόλῳ περιρραγεῖς διελύθη. Jer.'s arrow-and-stone imagery, however, is not attested elsewhere, and it may in fact be his own variation on the generic motif.

*detractor* This noun, a derivative of *detrahere*, is attested in the literature as both *detractor* and *detractator* (Hilberg printed *detractor* but noted that *detractator* is found in *G* and *K*); both forms combined recur some dozen other times in Jer.'s works. Their widespread use for 'slanderer' or 'backbiter' is a late Latin development (cf. *TLL* V 1 iv.822.46 ff.).

*qui aurem adcommodat detrahenti* For the locution *aurem adcommodare*, see e.g. Val. Max. *mem.* 5.8.3; Tert. *praescr. haer.* 16; Jer. *epist.* 22.34.1, 125.18.1; Ruf. *hist. eccl.* 5.18.5, 10.12; Aug. *util. cred.* 18.36; Vinc. Lér. *common.* 1 (in many of these instances in the Christian authors the expression is couched in an exhortation not to listen to slanderers).

*Chapter 15*

One of the chief pastoral duties of the Christian priest in Jer.'s day was to make house-calls to parishioners both rich and poor who were sick or in need of some kind of comfort. Earlier in the letter (5.6–8) Jer. detailed how Nepotian should conduct himself during his visits to the homes of virgins and widows so as to avoid temptation or scandal. In the present chapter he briefly reiterates the mandate to be discrete around women, but he does so in the broader context of admonishing Nepotian to maintain a sense of consummate professionalism. Above all, he must not betray the confidence of those who seek his help, nor should he become so familiar with certain members of his flock that he is primarily their friend and secondarily their priest.

*15.1*

*officii tui est ... officii ergo tui est* Jer. again (cf. on 13.2 *nolo te ... nolo te*) reinforces his admonitions with anaphora. He employs the genitive construction *officii est* + inf. on five other occasions in his extant writings; *officium est* + inf. is used at a slightly higher frequency.

*visitare languentes* At 3.2 Jer. listed *visitatio languentium* as one of the monastic activities that become more difficult to sustain as the body breaks down with age. In the early Christian centuries the visitation, caring for, and praying over the sick, which is mandated by the NT (Mt. 25:36; Jas. 5:14), was a pastoral ministry over which specially appointed Christian widows had charge (see on 5.5 *multas ... elemosynae*), but by the same token it was not restricted just to widows. It was regarded as a responsibility also of bishops and priests (e.g. Polyc. *epist. ad Php.* 6.1; Bas. *reg. mor.* 70.12, 18; John Chrys. *sacerd.* 3.16; Poss. *v. Aug.* 27.1–2; Ps.-Jer. *sept. ord. eccl.* 6 [PL 30:155–156]), monks (e.g. Bas. *reg. fus. tract.* 7 [PG 31:928–929]), and lay ascetic women (Jer. *epist.* 54.12.2, 130.14.8). Jer. says that Nepotian was exemplary in his performance of this duty (*epist.* 60.10.5).

*nosse domos, matronas ac liberos earum et nobilium virorum non ignorare secreta* At *epist.* 22.28.3 Jer. disparages womanizers who become priests in order to have freer access to the homes of noblewomen (*sunt alii—de mei ordinis hominibus loquor—, qui ideo ad presbyterium et diaconatum ambiunt, ut mulieres licentius videant*), and above at 5.6 he tells Nepotian not to become the confidante of lonely, chatty Christian women. He is not

contradicting that advice here: he encourages Nepotian to be acquainted with the female members of his flock in their individual domestic contexts so that he may more effectively minister to their spiritual needs (the unambiguously pastoral context is carefully set by *visitare languentes*). The same principle holds true for Christian noblemen. Jer. admonishes Nepotian *nobilium virorum non ignorare secreta*. Here *secreta* is better taken as ‘private matters’ than as ‘secrets’, for the latter word generally has a negative connotation in English—a connotation, potentially present in Latin as well, that Jer. seeks to defuse through the litotes *non ignorare*, so as to avoid giving the impression that he is advocating for Nepotian to be a snooping busy-body and purveyor of gossip (cf. below *nec alia domus quid agatur in alia per te noverit*). The thrust of his precept, moreover, is that the clergyman be reasonably well-informed about the personal lives of the aristocratic Christian men under his spiritual supervision such that he will be in a strategic position to hold them accountable, if necessary, for any clandestine moral indiscretions such as adultery, which was commonplace in upper-class late Roman society (see G. Nathan, *The Family in Late Antiquity* [Oxford, 2000], 98–103).

In his *De sacerdotio* (6.8) Chrysostom stresses the bishop’s responsibility to minister to women in his congregation, making house-calls when they are sick and doing whatever is in his power to ensure their emotional and spiritual well-being. Elsewhere in the same work (3.14) he says that bishops expose themselves to calumny if they prioritize visits to the homes of the rich over those of the poor, and at *hom. in Act.* 3.5 (PG 60:41) he speaks of how bishops are treated as supremely honored guests when they visit the homes of women and the nobility. Here Jer. names the *nobiles* as the Christian demographic with which Nepotian should thoroughly acquaint himself, but in the next subsection he is more open-ended with the prescription *omnium Christianorum domos debemus amare quasi proprias*. That Nepotian is expected to be privy to the *secreta* of the households to which he ministers of course presupposes that he first has earned their trust (cf. Greg. Magn. *reg. past.* 2.5 *tales autem sese qui praesunt exhibeant, quibus subiecti occulta quoque sua prodere non erubescant*).

*officii ergo tui est* Hilberg printed *officii ergo tui sit*, but the indicative *est*, found in e.g.  $\Sigma$ , is more sound, not only because it restores the arresting anaphora (see above on *officii tui est ... officii ergo tui est*) but also because Jer. has a documented preference for the impersonal construction *officium* (or *officii*) *est* + inf. (see e.g. *comm. in Eph.* lib. 3 p. 563, *adv. Iov.* 1.36, *apol. c. Ruf.* 1.22, *epist.* 49.17.2).

*non solum oculos castos servare sed et linguam* Abba John the Dwarf includes both chaste eyes and a tongue in his shortlist of required ascetic virtues: ἐν ἀγνείᾳ γλώσσης καὶ φυλακῇ ὀφθαλμῶν (PG 65:216). Jer.'s stipulation that the priest have chaste eyes (for *casti oculi*, see e.g. Ambr. *virg.* 2.4.29; Salv. *gub. dei* 3.9.43; cf. Evagr. Pont. *sent. virg.* 55 παρθένοι ὀφθαλμοί) is closely related to Christ's teaching not to sin with the eyes and thereby commit adultery in the heart (Mt. 5:27–30). At *epist.* 23.3.3 Jer. warns Eustochium to be on guard against the *inpudici oculi* of flatterers which gaze at the beauty of the body rather than of the soul. His exhortation to keep a chaste tongue is an indirect prohibition not against detraction *per se*, which he addressed in the previous chapter, but against gossip-mongering and talking lewdly about the physiques of women visited on house-calls, as he explains in the sentence to follow (*numquam de formis mulierum disputes nec alia domus quid agatur in alia per te noverit*). Cf. Julian Pomerius' condemnation of dirty-minded clerics who are always rating women's bodies: *hi sunt quibus usui est feminarum descriptio: illa rudis est, illa dicacula, illa deformis, illa formosa; alterius placet ornatus, gestus alterius; illius laudatur etiam sine forma festivitas, illius sola formositas* (v. cont. 3.6.5).

## 15.2

*Hippocrates adiurat discipulos antequam doceat et in verba sua iurare conpellit. extorquet sacramento silentium, sermonem, incessum, habitum moresque describit* The most relevant portion of the Hippocratic oath reads as follows: ἐς οἰκίας δὲ ὁκόσας ἂν ἐσίω, ἐσελεύσομαι ἐπ' ὠφελείῃ καμνόντων, ἐκτός ἐὼν πάσης ἀδικίης ἐκουσίης καὶ φθορίης, τῆς τε ἄλλης καὶ ἀφροδισίων ἔργων ἐπὶ τε γυναικείων σωμάτων καὶ ἀνδρῶν, ἐλευθέρων τε καὶ δούλων. ἃ δ' ἂν ἐν θεραπείῃ ἢ ἴδω, ἢ ἀκούσω, ἢ καὶ ἄνευ θεραπήτης κατὰ βίον ἀνθρώπων, ἃ μὴ χρή ποτε ἐκλαλέεσθαι ἔξω, σιγήσομαι, ἄρρήτα ἡγεύμενος εἶναι τὰ τοιαῦτα ("Whatever houses I may visit, I will come for the benefit of the sick, remaining free of all intentional injustice, of all mischief and in particular of sexual relations with both female and male persons, be they free or slaves. What I may see or hear in the course of the treatment of even outside of the treatment in regard to the life of men, which on no account one must spread abroad, I will keep to myself holding such things shameful to be spoken about"; L. Edelstein, *The Hippocratic Oath* [Baltimore, 1943], 2–3). The core elements of Jer.'s summary (*silentium, sermonem, incessum, habitum moresque*) are absent from the original oath as it has been handed down from classical antiquity. We may account for this discrepancy by positing that he had an imprecise knowledge of the contents of the oath and was including precepts

from various Hippocratic treatises (nevertheless, he may have known Hippocrates' writings only secondhand; see Hagendahl, 236); cf. L. MacKinney, "Medical Ethics and Etiquette in the Early Middle Ages: The Persistence of Hippocratic Ideals," *BHM* 26 (1952): 1–31 (4). In any event, this is a rare reference to the Hippocratic oath in late antique literature; on this scarcity of *testimonia*, see P. Kibre, *Hippocrates Latinus* (New York, 1985), 177–178. Passing mention of it is made by Gregory of Nazianzus (*orat.* 7.10), who says that his brother Caesarius studied medicine in Alexandria and practiced in Byzantium but never took the actual oath.

Jer.'s reference to the Hippocratic oath outside a conventional medical context, as a literary artifact, is striking, a point duly made by C. Galvão-Sobrinho, "Hippocratic Ideals, Medical Ethics, and the Practice of Medicine in the Early Middle Ages: The Legacy of the Hippocratic Oath," *JHMAS* 51 (1996): 438–455 (441–442, 453–454). He introduces it into his narrative probably partly to flaunt his purportedly universal learning (on this score his evidently imperfect acquaintance with the wording of the oath is doubly ironic), partly to add a certain legitimacy to his precepts by demonstrating that they are underpinned by the same fundamental assumptions about moral propriety as the traditional, centuries-old code of conduct prescribed for the medical profession.

*quanto magis nos, quibus animarum medicina commissa est* From his erudite reference to the Hippocratic oath Jer. eases into an apt portrayal of clerics as doctors of the soul. The Greek and Latin Fathers very often adverted to medical similes and metaphors to describe the pathology of the soul. See e.g. O. Temkin, *Hippocrates in a World of Pagans and Christians* (Baltimore, 1991), 171–177. To Temkin's cited *testimonia* may be added e.g. Clem. Alex. *strom.* 7.1.3.2; Orig. *c. Cels.* 3.61; John Chrys. *hom. in 2 Tim.* 5.4 (PG 62:630); Greg. Magn. *reg. past.* 1.1. See further B. Lançon, "Maladie et médecine dans les lettres," in Duval, 355–366 (362–364). A related theme is that of Christ as the supreme Physician; see e.g. R. Arbesman, "The Concept of *Christus Medicus* in St. Augustine," *Traditio* 10 (1954): 1–28; P.C.J. Eijkenboom, *Het Christus-medicusmotief in de preken van Sint Augustinus* (Assen, 1960); S. Griffith, "Iatros and medicus in Gregory Nazianzen and Augustine," *StudPatr* 41 (2006): 319–326.

*omnium Christianorum domos debemus amare quasi proprias* To further emphasize the clergyman's duty to maintain a high moral standard in his house-call etiquette, Jer. follows his medical allusion with a reworking of the evangelical mandate to love one's neighbor as oneself (e.g. Mt. 19:19).

According to Acts 11:26, it was at Antioch that the followers of Jesus first came to be popularly known as 'Christians'; cf. E. Bickerman, "The Name of Christians," *HThR* 42 (1949): 109–124; H. Mattingly, "The Origin of the Name *Christiani*," *JThS* n.s. 9 (1958): 26–37. For the earliest extant occurrences of the terms Χριστιανοί and *Christiani* in non-Christian literature, see Jos. *ant.* 18.64; Plin. *min. epist.* 10.96–97; Tac. *ann.* 15.44.3–4; Suet. *Ner.* 16.2, and for their appearance in martyrological literature of the second and third centuries, see J.N. Bremmer, "*Christianus sum*: The Early Christian Martyrs and Christ," in G.J.M. Bartelink, A. Hilhorst, and C.H. Kneepkens (eds.), *Eulogia: Mélanges offerts à Antoon A.R. Bastiaensen* (The Hague, 1991), 11–20 (14–18); cf. A. Ferrua, "*Christianus sum*," *CivCatt* 84 (1933): 13–26.

*consolatores potius nos in maeroribus suis quam convivas in prosperis noverint* This precept is made more memorable and rhetorically forceful through syntactical parallelism (*disiunctio*) and twofold antithesis (*consolatores ... convivas* and *maeroribus ... prosperis*). Consoling parishioners is mentioned as a duty of the cleric also by Chrysostom (*sacerd.* 6.8), Julian Pomerius (*v. cont.* 1.25.1), and Gregory the Great (*reg. past.* 2.5).

Nepotian is said to have fulfilled the requirement set down here: *gaudere cum gaudentibus, flere cum flentibus, caecorum baculus, esurientium cibus, spes miserorum, solamen lugentium fuit* (*epist.* 60.10.5).

*facile contemnitur clericus qui saepe vocatus ad prandium non recusat* The *prandium* was the midday meal, and its fare was simple and often consisted of leftovers from the previous evening's *cena*. A decade earlier Jer. had drawn a satiric sketch of the clerical gourmet who regularly lunches at the homes of the well-to-do and has a discriminating nose for sniffing out quality meals (*epist.* 22.28.5, with Adkin, 263). The clerical type satirized in the present passage, whose unwillingness to turn down invitations to dine with wealthy parishioners is accentuated by the litotes *non recusat* (on *recusare* in litotic constructions, see M.E. Hoffmann, *Negatio contrarii* [Assen, 1987], 154), is made to fit the basic profile of the parasite from classical comedy who is always on the hunt for a free meal (for the association of the verb *vocare*, in its participial form in this passage, with the activities of the parasite, see e.g. Plaut. *Men.* 458).

Jer. was by no means alone in strongly disapproving of clergymen being social diners. Both Augustine, as bishop of Hippo, and Chrysostom, as bishop of Constantinople, are said to have declined all invitations to eat at the homes of the wealthy (Poss. *v. Aug.* 27.5; Socr. *hist. eccl.* 6.4.5–6), Martin of Tours refused to dine at the table of the emperor Maximus (Sulp. Sev. *v. Mart.*



20.2), and Gregory of Nazianzus says that he does not stroll from house to house stuffing himself on gossip and food (*orat.* 33.8). Ambrose advises his priests against feasting at the homes of non-Christians (*off.* 1.86).

*Chapter 16*

With the miscellany of precepts given in this chapter Jer. brings the didactic portion of his letter to a close. He warns not to make a habit of accepting gifts and not to arrange marriages for widows, and he also instructs him how to be a conscientious almoner.

## 16.1

*numquam petentes raro accipiamus rogati* By modern editorial convention this exhortation opens a new chapter, but conceptually it belongs to the previous chapter, where Jer. sets down some guidelines to govern Nepotian's relations with his parishioners when he makes his obligatory social calls. Just as he must not cross professional boundaries by being so familiar with them that he becomes a fixture at their tables (*facile contemnitur clericus qui saepe vocatus ad prandium non recusat*), so also must he not make a habit of accepting gifts from them. Any number of practical concerns can reasonably be said to underlie Jer.'s stipulation, but two in particular may be singled out. The first concern is about Nepotian violating his monastic poverty (cf. 5.2–4) by accumulating presents such as expensive furniture and designer clothing; regarding this latter, we are reminded of how Bishop Augustine's wealthier congregants would give him fine robes and other garments (*serm.* 161.10, 356.13; cf. *epist.* 263.1), which he would refuse to wear because they did not jibe with his monastic lifestyle. Jer.'s second principal concern is that Nepotian, as the recipient of favors, will feel obligated to use his clerical influence to pay down his debt of gratitude (see following n.) by securing the special interests of his benefactor(s), thereby potentially exposing himself to accusations of favoritism and bribe-taking; cf. Jul. Pom. v. *cont.* 1.21.1, who satirically describes pandering priests who shirk from confronting their wealthy benefactors for their sinful lifestyles for fear that these people will stop showering gifts upon them. In connection with this latter point it may be noted with some irony that when living in Rome Jer. himself had received from his affluent female devotees—e.g. Eustochium and Marcella, to whom his letters of thanks have been preserved as *epist.* 31 and 44 (on this first letter, see L. Takács, "The Presents of Eustochium," *AAnthung* 43 [2003]: 211–228)—gifts over and above the literary patronage that they bestowed upon him (on their patronage of his literary labors, see Cain 2009a, 34–98, *passim*). Yet when reproached by his critics for opportunism, he resolutely denied that he had ever taken money or gifts, however trifling, from anyone (*epist.* 45.2.2 *pecuniam cuius*

*accepi? munera vel parva vel magna non spreui? in manu mea aes alicuius insonuit?* [Jer. is echoing Samuel's plea of innocence at 1Sam. 12:3]). Perhaps here, as elsewhere in the letter to Nepotian (see e.g. on 5.6 *solus ... sed eas*), his personal misfortunes in the past shaped his precepts in the present.

Several MSS ( $\Sigma$ ,  $N$ ,  $k$ ,  $B$ ,  $\varsigma$ ) add here: *beatius est magis* [*om.*  $\Sigma$ ] *dare quam accipere*, a statement attributed to Christ by Paul in Acts 20:35 (this dominical saying does not appear in any of the canonical Gospels, but for similar sentiments, see Lk. 6:38, 11.9–13; Jn. 13:34). It is not found in the earliest of Hilberg's MSS, and the Austrian editor accordingly treated it as a later scribal interpolation.

*nescio quo enim modo etiam ipse qui deprecatur ut tribuat cum acceperis vilio rem te iudicat et mirum in modum, si rogan tem contempseris, plus miratur* Roman society, like modern western society in general, observed strict protocol regarding gift-exchange: whenever a gift was bestowed the receiver became indebted to the giver and had a social obligation to reciprocate with a convincing expression of gratitude (Sen. *ben.* 1.10.4–5, 2.24.2–4, 2.31.1, 2.32.4, 2.33.1–2, 2.35.1). The same principle applied to epistolary communication, inasmuch as the letter was viewed as a 'gift' and the recipient had the obligation to respond with a letter, preferably one of at least equal length and substance; see e.g. P. Bruggisser, *Symmaque ou le rituel épistolaire de l'amitié littéraire* (Freiburg, 1993), 4–16. Gratitude for a gift, be it a letter or something else, could be conveyed through verbal appreciation (cf. Sen. *ben.* 2.24.2), material favor, or some other means; cf. G. Peterman, *Paul's Gift from Philippi: Conventions of Gift-Exchange and Christian Giving* (Cambridge, 1997), 69–88, and on the concept of gratitude more generally, see P. Kraft, 'Gratus animus (Dankbarkeit)', *RAC* 12 (1983): 733–752. Failure to register an appropriate degree of gratitude was considered reprehensible (cf. Sen. *ben.* 3.1.1 *non referre beneficiis gratiam et est turpe et apud omnes habetur*; see also Cic. *off.* 2.83) and could very likely provoke the wrath of the slighted benefactor (cf. Plut. *Brut.* 2). Jer.'s description of the spurned giver's magnanimous reaction to ingratitude would have seemed implausible and counter-intuitive to the average reader. He presents his observation as a statement of fact, yet, as if to anticipate his reader's disbelief at such an odd proposition, he introduces it with the agnostic *nescio quomodo* and also inserts *mirum in modum* (see following n.). Moreover, Jer. radically reconceptualizes traditional gift-exchange etiquette, but he does so exclusively within the framework of an ascetic value-system: the giver, instead of being honored by the receiver with grateful appreciation, now

honors the ungrateful recipient for his rejection of favors, though what he is *really* honoring is the ascetic's contempt for the norms of secular culture.

*mirum in modum* This expression, found eighteen other times in Jer., does not occur at a greater frequency in any previous or contemporaneous Latin author. Its initial component, *mirum*, may be intentionally paronomasiac with the neighboring *miratur*, which concludes the period.

*praedicator continentiae nuptias ne conciliet. qui apostolum legit: "superest ut et qui habent uxores sic sint quasi non habentes", cur virginem cogit ut nubat?* As a matter of principle Jer. was not in favor of either marriage or remarriage among ascetic Christians, especially if the connubial relationship has a sexual component (see Laurence, 261–265, 277–302). His directive to Nepotian to not encourage virgins to marry or widows to remarry therefore is not at all surprising (clerical matchmaking is condemned also at Ambr. *off.* 1.248; Poss. v. *Aug.* 27.4). It is grounded in the role of advocate for the celibate life (*praedicator continentiae*) that Jer. assigns to his young addressee, a role that of course presupposes Nepotian's own celibacy (he is mentioned as being *continens* at *epist.* 60.10.5). Furthermore, he has Nepotian endorsing the ascetic interpretation of 1 Cor. 7, signified by a quotation of v. 29. This verse as well as the chapter in which it is embedded is one of the principal biblical proof-texts cited by ascetic writers (see Clark, 308–312, 355–357, 362–363); for Jer.'s deployment of it in the context of the pro-virginity debate, see Y.-M. Duval, *L'affaire Jovinien* (Paris, 2003), 54, 56, 140–141, 147–148, 171, 187, 328.

*qui de monogamia sacerdos est quare viduam hortatur ut digama sit?* The preposition *de* has here almost a causal sense (see A. Guillemin, *La préposition 'de' dans la littérature latine* [Paris, 1920] 81n1), i.e. "a man whose priesthood is defined by [or based upon the notion of] single marriage". At *comm. in Tit.* 1.6–7 ll. 308–311 Jer. says that the presbyter and bishop must be sexually pure and never be married more than once so that they may effectively exhort others to follow their example. Like Jer., Popes Damasus and Siricius, Ambrosiaster, and Ambrose all believed that sexual continence and even celibacy were essential to the ritual purity required of priests and bishops; see J.-P. Audet, *Mariage et célibat dans le service pastoral de l'église* (Paris, 1967), 165–171; Hunter, 213–219.

## 16.2

*procuratores et dispensatores domorum alienarum atque villarum quomodo esse possunt qui proprias iubentur contemnere facultates?* Jer.'s fellow theorists on clerical *officia* Ambrose (*off.* 2.144) and Julian Pomerius (*v. cont.* 2.11) saw no contradiction in terms in a voluntarily poor priest administering money and property given to the church by wealthy donors, provided of course that he be a conscientious almoner with absolutely no intentions to enrich himself in the process. Jer., then, takes a more hardline stance on this issue than either Ambrose or Julian (cf. *Jer. epist.* 58.6.3). His real concern here, as he proceeds to explain, is that the monastic *sacerdos* not be a glorified manager of money (i.e. in the form of coinage) or of property: whatever he receives from generous benefactors he must immediately distribute to the poor and not hold onto any funds as long as there are hungry mouths to feed. Depending upon the Christian donor's net worth and his or her generosity, the sums involved could be huge. Most senatorial wealth during the late Empire took the form of land holdings, and even the more modestly propertied elites owned numerous estates at home and abroad (M.T.W. Arneheim, *The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire* [Oxford, 1972], 142–154): e.g. Macrina's mother Emmelia in three different provinces (Pontus, Cappadocia, Armenia) (*Greg. Nys. v. Macr.* 5); Symmachus in Italy, Sicily, and Mauritania (he owned nineteen houses and estates in all, as tabulated by O. Seeck, *Q. Aurelii Symmachi quae supersunt* [Berlin, 1883], xlv–xlvi); Pammachius in Italy and Numidia (*Aug. epist.* 58.1); Olympias in Thrace, Galatia, Cappadocia, Bithynia, and Constantinople (*Anon. v. Olymp.* 5); and Pinianus and Melania the Younger in Spain, Campania, Sicily, Africa, Mauritania, Britain, and elsewhere (*Geront. v. Mel.* 11); for fuller descriptions of Melania's landed wealth, see J.M. Blázquez, 'Las Posesiones de Melania la Joven', in J. Martí-i-Aixala et al. (eds.), *Historiam pictura refert* (Rome, 1994), 67–80; Clark 1984.

*amico quippiam rapere furtum est, ecclesiam fraudare sacrilegium est* This sententious statement, the rhetorical import of which is enhanced by isocolon, perfect parison, asyndeton, and antistrophe, is quoted authoritatively (but without attribution) in Canon 4 of the Council of Vaison of 442 (cf. Cain 2010d, 14–15), where it is taken out of its original context to condemn family members of the deceased faithful who refuse to turn over to the ecclesiastical treasury legacies that their relatives had willed to the church (*tales enim quasi egentium necatores nec credentes iudicium dei habendi sunt unius quoque patrum in hoc, quam scriptis suis inseruit, congruente senten-*

*tia qua ait: amico quippiam rapere furtum est, ecclesiam fraudare sacrilegium* [CCSL 148:98]).

*furtum* Throughout the history of Roman law a distinction between two basic types of theft was recognized: manifest theft (*furtum manifestum*), in which the thief is caught in the act of stealing, and non-manifest theft (*furtum nec manifestum*), in which there are no eyewitnesses to the crime (see R. Zimmerman, *The Law of Obligations* [Cape Town, 1992], 922–952). *furtum* was treated as a delict (*delictum*) which was prosecutable only by the person wronged, who could sue for damages in the hope of being compensated for the value of the stolen item, regardless of whether the item was ever recovered. He might also seek from the accused thief a fine, payable to himself, amounting to either twofold (for *furtum nec manifestum*) or fourfold (for *furtum manifestum*) the value of the stolen goods. This, at any rate, was the law in theory. In practice, victims probably only rarely could reasonably expect to receive full or even substantial restitution, since thieves, generally speaking, resorted to crime because they did not have the financial wherewithal to live a comfortable, law-abiding life, much less to pay potentially hefty fines (J.M. Kelly, *Roman Litigation* [Oxford, 1966], 162–163).

*sacrilegium* Jer. uses this strong word to convey his personal disgust for theft (on which, see G. Violaro, *Il pensiero giuridico di san Girolamo* [Milan, 1937], 228–229). His attitude was shared by his protégée Paula, who despised theft in general as a sacrilegious act (*furtum quasi sacrilegium detestabatur*) and regarded it as an extremely grave offense in monasteries (*hoc in monasteriis gravissimum dicebat esse delictum; epist. 108.20.6*).

*accepisse* In late Latin prose, as well as in classical poetry, the perfect active infinitive often is used instead of the present, though with a present meaning, for the sake of emphasis (cf. Allen-Greenough, § 486e; Skahill, 162–163). *accepisse* is an example of this tendency and it accordingly is to be taken as emphatic, that much the more because it is the very first word in the sentence. What is being underscored is not so much the clergyman's actual receipt of funds but rather, by implication, his responsible use of these funds, as we see from the remainder of the elaborate period.

*pauperibus* See on 3.2 *defensio pauperum*.

*esurientibus plurimis vel cautum esse velle vel timidum* Here the infinitive *velle*, which combines with *vel ... vel* to produce some modest soundplay

(parechesis), is not volitional (i.e. ‘to wish to be’) but pleonastic with *esse* and so it has no proper equivalent in English. Several translators, unaware of this nuance, have misrendered this verb: cf. e.g. Labourt, 2.191: “*vouloir être prudent ou timoré*”, and Ruiz Bueno, 1.425: “*querer ser cauto o tímido*” (my emphases). The pleonastic usage of *volo* and other verbs (*incipio, coepei, possum, debeo*) became commonplace in late Latin and especially in Vulgar Latin prose (see Hofmann, 796; Skahill, 200–203). This usage of the infinitive *velle* in particular is attested on numerous occasions in Jer. For examples, see Goelzer, 422–423, to whose inventory may be added *epist.* 2.4 *coepei velle desinere*, 3.5.2 *ut coeperim velle te colere*.

As Jer. does in the case of the timid clerical almoner, so Chrysostom (*hom. de eleem.* 6 [PG 51:269–271]) scolds his wealthy congregants for being too cautious about dispensing their money to the poor: they should not scrutinize the worthiness of each prospective recipient, as if looking for an excuse not to give to certain people, but should give indiscriminately to all in need (for this same exhortation, cf. Jer. *comm. in Eccl.* 11.1 ll. 2–4). At *epist.* 108.16.1 Jer. confirms that rich donors showing favoritism to a few but withholding their largesse from the majority of the needy was a widespread problem in his day (*solent pleraeque matronarum ... in paucos largitate profusa manum a ceteris retrahere*). Precisely because some and perhaps many aristocratic Christians in Late Antiquity were finicky about almsgiving, hagiographic heroes and heroines of senatorial stock from this period are routinely idealized in the literary sources as being indiscriminately generous to all (see Greg. Naz. *orat.* 18.20; Jer. *epist.* 108.5.1; Pall. *hist. Laus.* 54.1).

*aut, quod apertissimi sceleris est, aliquid inde subtrahere* Jer. has already noted the heinousness of this offense; cf. e.g. on 9.2 *melius ... petere*.

*omnium praedonum crudelitatem superat* For heightened rhetorical effect Jer. concludes the period with this stunning hyperbole whereby he consigns the reluctant clerical almoner to the company as brigands, who were proverbially rapacious (see on 7.2 *accusare avaritiam et latro potest*).

### 16.3

*ego fame torqueor et tu iudicas quantum ventri meo satis sit?* For the sake of vividness Jer. temporarily speaks sarcastically in the *persona* of the famished *pauper* (ἡθοποιία, the rhetorical device he employed in ch. 6; see on 6.3 *natus ... delectant*). The expression *fame torqueri*, which is attested in Pliny the Younger (*pan.* 31.6), was later used by Jer. in reference to Exsuperius,

the monastic bishop of Toulouse, whose passion for feeding the hungry is motivated by the anguish he feels for their plight (*fame torquetur aliena, epist. 125.20.3*).

*nemo me melius mea servare potest. optimus dispensator est qui sibi nihil reservat* These two flashy sentences achieve poignancy through not only their gnomic quality but also the euphonic effect produced by fourfold initial-sequent and initial-interior alliteration (*nemo me melius mea*) and paronomasia (*servare ... reservat*).

A few years earlier Jer. had attributed the same argument to Hilarion. After the wealthy layman Orion had been cured of demonic possession by Hilarion, out of gratitude he brought many fine gifts and presented them to the thaumaturge, who refused to accept them as payment for the miracle. Orion persisted, begging him to take them so that he could at least relay them to the poor, but Hilarion again balked, responding: *tu melius tua potes distribuere, qui per urbes ambulas et nosti pauperes. ego, qui mea reliqui, cur aliena appetam? multis nomen pauperum occasio avaritia est; misericordia artem non habet. nemo melius erogat quam qui sibi nihil reservat* (v. Hilar. 10.13–14). The almsgiving philosophy advocated by Jer. and attributed by him to Hilarion was espoused by other monks as well. The Egyptian monk Abba Hephestion is a case in point. Melania the Younger and her husband Pinianus tried to give him some gold to be redistributed to the needy, but he adamantly refused on the ground that there were no poor people in the desert, and he finally threw the gold into the river (Geront. v. Mel. 38). Likewise the Syrian ascetic monk Polychronius never accepted money to be redistributed to the poor but always instructed the givers to be the almoners of their own offerings (Theod. hist. rel. 24.9). There were exceptions. In the Greek *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* (14.19–22) the story is told of a bean merchant from Alexandria who sailed downstream along the Nile from the Upper Thebaid with one hundred ships, distributing his estate and stock of merchandise to the poor and the monks along the way. When he brought ten sacks of beans and lentils to Paphnutius, the latter exhorted him to take up the monastic life at once and leave the distribution of his property to his servants, and the merchant complied.

*qui sibi nihil reservat* Jer. uses the same phraseology to describe the complete self-dispossession of both Nepotian (*epist. 60.10.2 nihil sibi amplius reservavit*) and Hilarion (v. Hilar. 2.6 *nihil sibi omnino reservans*; cf. ibid. 10.14 *qui sibi nihil reservat*); cf. his encomium of Paula: *nemo plus dedit pauperibus quam quae sibi nihil reliquit* (*epist. 108.30.2*).



The importance in early monastic culture of keeping back nothing for oneself is illustrated by an anecdote ascribed to John Cassian and preserved among the *Apophthegmata patrum* (PG 65:245). A distinguished imperial official renounced his riches and distributed them to the poor, yet held on to a little for himself because he did not want to suffer the humiliation of complete self-dispossession, and (according to John) he was rebuked by Basil of Caesarea for relinquishing his senatorial rank without becoming a true monk.

*Chapter 17*

Jer. has just concluded the didactic portion of the letter and now adds a post-script in which he vindicates his method of satiric moralizing against 'secularized' clergymen and pre-emptively defends himself from criticism, such as the kind that engulfed his famous treatise on virginity which he had dedicated to Eustochium a decade earlier at Rome. Dressing up his prose with stylish evocations of Terence, Christ, and St. Paul, he retroactively attempts to disguise the polemical thrust of his letter by casting himself as an authoritative moralist motivated solely by a keen sense of Christian charity.

## 17.1

*coegisti* In the ancient Latin prose preface the author conventionally employed verbs of compulsion like *cogere* to indicate that the patron of his literary work was persuasive to the point that he had no choice but to accept the commission; see T. Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions* (Stockholm, 1964), 120. In the case of a controversial work such verbs had the additional aim of insulating the author from criticism by ostensibly shifting the responsibility for the composition to the commissioner (Cain 2009a, 52).

*Nepotiane carissime* Jer. used this same formula of address in the opening line of the letter when announcing its occasion (see on 1.1 *Nepotiane carissime*), but now he uses it in an apologetic context to remind his critics that the treatise has a dedicatee who bears ultimate responsibility for commissioning it in the first place (see previous n.).

*lapidato iam virginitatis libello, quem sanctae Eustochiae Romae scripseram* Eustochium (born c.370) was the third of Paula's five children. She had been consecrated a virgin by early 384. Along with her mother, she was associated with the ascetic circle of Marcella (cf. Jer. *epist.* 46.1.2). Jer. became her primary mentor perhaps in 383, and in the spring of 384 he dedicated to her a treatise on preserving virginity (*epist.* 22). Throughout his literary corpus he calls this work, as he does here, a *libellus* (*epist.* 22.2.2, 22.22.3, 31.2.2; cf. Sulp. Sev. *dial.* 1.8.4; Ruf. *apol. c. Hier.* 2.5, 6, 13), a *liber* (*epist.* 49.18.3, 123.17.3, 130.19.3, *adv. Iov.* 1.13, *apol. c. Ruf.* 1.30), and at *vir. ill.* 135 he cites it as *Ad Eustochium de virginitate servanda*. In the autumn of 385 she left Rome with her mother, whom she joined on pilgrimage to the Holy Land and with whom she settled permanently in Bethlehem in the early summer of 386.

When Paula died in January of 404 (see Cain 2013a), Eustochium succeeded her mother as abbess of the convent and served in this capacity until her death in 419. One piece of personal correspondence from Jer. to Eustochium has survived, a short letter thanking her for some gifts she had sent to him (*epist.* 31). Despite the fact that she is the joint dedicatee, with her mother, of the majority of Jer.'s biblical translations and commentaries (for a complete listing, see Fürst, 174), Eustochium's name was perhaps most readily associated among Christian contemporaries outside Jer.'s literary circle with *Epistula* 22, and Jer. for his own part garnered no small amount of notoriety for being its author. Soon after he had released it in Rome in the first half of 384, the writing became a magnet for criticism. While pagans apparently applauded him for airing the dirty laundry of Roman Christianity for all to see and even made a cottage industry out of copying and disseminating the treatise (Ruf. *apol. c. Hier.* 2.5, 43), lay and clerical Christians who did not subscribe to his extreme ascetic ideology not only were alarmed and even offended by the work's theological implications (e.g. that marriage is vastly inferior to celibacy), but also readers, especially Roman clergymen, took issue with Jer.'s satiric caricatures of them as impostors and hypocrites. Jer. acknowledges its rocky reception among contemporaries here (it was "stoned"; this figurative usage of *lapidare* is late; cf. *TLL* VII 2.945.33 ff.) and also at *epist.* 27.2.2, 117.1.2–3, 130.19.3–4; cf. Cain 2009a, 100–102; R. Goodrich, "*Vir maxime catholicus*: Sulpicius Severus' Use and Abuse of Jerome in the *Dialogi*," *JEH* 58 (2007): 189–210; P. Laurence, "L'Épître 22 de Jérôme et son temps," in L. Nadjo and É. Gavoille (eds.), *Epistulae antiquae* (Paris, 2000), 63–83.

*Eustochiae* In his works Jer. calls her both Eustochia and Eustochium (cf. Εὐστόχιον), but he seems to prefer the latter (Vogüé, 5.236n9). A comparable degree of interchangeability can be observed with Melania the Younger's name as it is attested in both its Greek and Latin forms: Μελανία, Μελάνιον, Μελάνη; Melania, Melanion, Melanion (D. Gorce, *Vie de sainte Mélanie* [Paris, 1962], 20–22). On female names of Greek derivation in the neuter, cf. Donatus' comment: *Dorcium femininum nomen est, ut Planesium, Glycerium* (P. Wessner, *Aeli Donati quod fertur Commentum Terenti* [Leipzig, 1902], 2.389, 23).

*post annos decem rursus Bethlem ora reserare* This is not some innocuous announcement made simply to inform readers about his current whereabouts. He implies by *ora reserare* that during the past decade, ever since the release of his controversial *libellus* on virginity at Rome (see above on

*lapidato ... scripseram*), he has kept quietly and peacefully to himself in Bethlehem. Read in conjunction with what follows below, where he portrays himself as a humble and holy ascetic moralist, his claim that he has for ten years maintained an unassuming presence in Bethlehem indicates that he is accessing one of the literary self-images he cultivates consistently throughout his works, namely that of a penitential monk hiding out in the remote seclusion of the Palestinian countryside (for invocations of this literary *persona*, see *epist.* 57.13.2, 27\*.1, 82.6.1, 105.3.1, 117.1.2, 120, *prol.*, *apol. c. Ruf.* 1.32, 3.19; cf. *epist.* 75.4.2). *ora reserare* also implies that he has not written anything to excite controversy in the previous decade. The impression he gives is of course gravely misleading. A year prior to composing the letter to Nepotian he had dispatched to Rome his *Adversus Iovinianum* in two books, and this writing, in many respects the most vitriolic literary production of his prolific career, ignited a firestorm soon after reaching Italian soil. Its theological excesses (e.g. Jer.'s quasi-Manichaean devaluation of the married state) and abusive tone (e.g. Jer. calls Jovinian and his sympathizers carnal-minded 'Epicureans'; see *adv. Iov.* 1.1, 2.21, 36, 38) agitated not only the author's lay and clerical opponents in Rome but also members of his own inner circle. As a case in point, the senator Pammachius was so put off by his old friend's latest polemical antics that he frantically tried to remove as many copies of *Adversus Iovinianum* as he could from circulation and demanded that he retract or at least qualify some of the more sensationalistic statements he had made in the writing (see Cain 2009a, 135–139). Moreover, Jer. had kept anything but a low profile since relocating to Bethlehem. He engages here in revisionist autobiography so as to rehabilitate his embattled public image and persuade his readership that he avoids controversy at all costs: he has been lured out of his prolonged self-imposed silence not because he is eager to foment strife but *only* because the incessant prodding of an admiring disciple (cf. 1.1 *petis ... et crebro petis*, 17.1 *coegisti*) has obliged him to fulfill his pastoral responsibility, even though this means braving the attacks of slandering tongues. In the prologue to *Epistula* 117 Jer. similarly portrays himself as a reluctant moralist in order to offset his reputation for being pugnacious and to demonstrate that he is in fact a peace-loving and compassionate doctor of souls, and here, as in the letter to Nepotian, *Epistula* 22 forms the backdrop of his revisionist self-fashioning (see Cain 2009b).

*confodiendum me linguis omnium prodere* This locution is employed again by Jer. at *praef. in lib. Ezr.* p. 638 *Weber legite de his exemplaribus quae nuper a nobis edita maledicorum cotidie linguis confodiuntur*. Both occurrences are duly noted in *TLL* IV ii.246.3f., 25ff.

*aut enim nihil scribendum fuit ne hominum iudicium subiremus, quod tu facere prohibuisti, aut scribentes nosse cunctorum adversum nos maledicorum tela torquenda* Cf. Jer.'s lament about his fate as a public literary figure: *statim ut aliquid scripsero, aut amatores mei aut invidi diverso quidem studio, sed pari certamine in vulgus nostra disseminant et vel in laude vel in vituperatione nimii sunt non meritum stili, sed suum stomachum sequentes* (epist. 48.2.2; note the extended alliterative sibilant at the end of this passage which creates a stunning acoustic effect and emphatically underscores the rancor of his critics). Expressed insecurity, whether feigned or genuine, about subjecting oneself to the critical judgment of readers, especially those who will find fault with a work's style, is a *topos* of Latin literature (cf. e.g. Sulp. Sev. v. *Mart.*, prol. 1; Patr. conf. 9).

The collocation of *telum* and *torquere* is primarily poetic (Virg. *Aen.* 12.536; Luc. *Phars.* 3.567; Sil. *Pun.* 1.253, 17.322). In post-classical prose it is found also in Ambrose (*hex.* 6.5.33).

## 17.2

*quos obsecro ut quiescant et desinant maledicere* Hilberg printed *obsecro* without *ut*, but he failed to specify the MS(S) on whose authority he based this editorial decision. I have restored *ut*, which is found in *Σ*, *D*, *N*, and *B*, because on every one of the more than seventy-five occasions in Jer.'s works that *obsecro* introduces a final clause (as it does here), it is followed by *ut* (or *ne*), and indeed one of these very occurrences is above at 5.3 (*obsecro itaque te et repetens iterum iterumque monebo ne officium clericatus genus antiquae militiae putes*).

This passage is an allusion to the prologue to Terence's *Andria* (vv. 22–23 *dehinc ut quiescant porro moneo et desinant / maledicere, ut malefacta ne noscant sua*), in which the playwright responds to critics, namely the dramatist Luscius Lanuvinus (cf. C. Garton, *Personal Aspects of the Roman Theatre* [Toronto, 1972], 41–139), who had accused him of *contaminatio*, the literary 'crime' of using elements from more than one Greek play to compose one in Latin, as opposed to modelling a Latin play exclusively on a single Greek original. Jer. evokes the same passage, and numerous other ones from Terence's plays, at *comm. in Mic.* lib. 2, prol. ll. 223–238, in order to deflect from himself criticism that he 'plagiarized' the Origen's biblical exegesis: *moneo autem tauros pingues, qui circumdederunt me, ut quiescant et desinant maledicere, malefacta ne noscant sua* [*Andr.* 22–23], *quae proferentur post, si pergent laedere* [*Eun.* 18]. *nam quod dicunt, Origenis me volumina compilare, et contaminari non decere* [*Andr.* 16] *veterum scripta, quod*

*illi maledictum vehemens esse existimant, eandem laudem ego maximam duco, cum illum imitari volo, quem cunctis prudentibus, et vobis placere non dubito* [cf. *Ad.* 17–19]. *si enim criminis est Graecorum benedicta trans-ferre, accusentur Ennius et Maro, Plautus* [cf. *Andr.* 18–19 *Plautum, Ennium accusant*], *Caecilius et Terentius, Tullius quoque et ceteri eloquentes viri, qui non solum versus, sed multa capita et longissimos libros ac fabulas integras transtulerunt ... quorum omnium aemulari exopto neglegentiam, potius quam istorum obscuram diligentiam* [*Andr.* 20–21].

*non enim ut adversarii sed ut amici scripsimus, nec invecti sumus in eos qui peccant sed ne peccent monuimus* In keeping with the non-confrontational tone that he has adopted thus far in this chapter (see on 17.1 *post annos ... prodere*), Jer. now becomes overtly conciliatory, giving assurances that while he hates the sin, he loves the sinner and is concerned solely with his spiritual improvement (at *epist.* 69.8.2 he likewise insists that in pointing out corruption his interest is in building up the church, not in caviling at individual members of the clergy). For this sentiment in patristic literature, cf. e.g. John Chrys. *hom. in Act.* 3.5 (PG 60:40) μή δὴ νομίσητέ τι τῶν παρ' ἡμῶν λεγομένων πρὸς ἀπέχθειαν λέγεσθαι, ἀλλὰ πρὸς διόρθωσιν; *apoph. patr.* Syn-cletica 13 (PG 65:425) τί μισεῖς τὸν λυπήσαντα ἄνθρωπον; οὐκ αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀδικήσας, ἀλλ' ὁ διάβολος. μίσησον τὴν νόσον καὶ μὴ τὸν νοσοῦντα; Aug. *epist.* 93.4, 211.11. Philostratus (*v. soph.* 1.7) similarly says of Dio Chrysostom that, though his invective was heavy-handed, he nevertheless tempered it with kindness, while Chrysostom (*hom. in Act.* 5.3 [PG 60:53]) describes at length the benevolent sternness that is a defining trait of preachers like himself: πάλιν ἀναγκάζομαι ἀηδὴς φαίνεσθαι καὶ φορτικὸς καὶ βαρὺς· ἀλλὰ τί πάθω; εἰς τοῦτο κεῖμαι. καθάπερ παιδαγωγὸς χαλεπὸς εἰς τοῦτο κείται, εἰς τὸ μισεῖσθαι παρὰ τῶν παιδαγωγουμένων· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς· πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄτοπον, τοὺς μὲν παρὰ βασιλέων τάξιν τινὰ ταχθέντας, καὶ ἀηδεῖς ἢ τὸ προσταττόμενον ποιεῖν· ἡμᾶς δὲ διὰ τὴν παρ' ὑμῶν μέμψιν ἐλλείπειν τὴν τάξιν, ἣν ἐτάχθημεν; ἄλλος ἔργον ἔχει ἕτερον· ὑμῶν δὲ πολλοὶ ἔργον ἔχουσι, τὸ ἐλεεῖν, τὸ φιланθρωπεύεσθαι, ἡδεῖς εἶναι καὶ προσηνεῖς τοῖς εὐεργετουμένοις· ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῖς ὠφελουμένοις βαρεῖς φαινόμεθα καὶ χαλεποὶ, καὶ φορτικοὶ καὶ ἀηδεῖς· οὐ γὰρ δι' ὧν τέρπομεν ὠφελοῦμεν, ἀλλὰ δι' ὧν δάκνομεν.

*neque in illos tantum sed et in nos ipsos severi iudices fuimus* At first glance Jer. seems to place himself on an equal footing with his critics by declaring that he has been as hard on himself as he has been on them, but in fact this statement is calculated to place him, by implication, in a superior position by fortifying his *persona* as a moralist who is self-aware rather than

self-righteous. For these critics require someone like Jer. to point out their faults so that they may then correct them, while Jer. has the introspective capacity and integrity to identify (and correct) his own faults. Cf. *orat.* 32.14, where Gregory of Nazianzus, assuming an apologetic tone like Jer.'s here, observes that most people are swift to find fault with others' conduct but slow to judge their own.

*volentesque festucam de oculo alterius tollere nostram prius trabem eiecimus* Jer. is alluding to Christ's rebuke of the scribes and Pharisees: *quid autem vides festucam in oculo fratris tui et trabem in oculo tuo non vides? aut quomodo dicis fratri tuo: sine eiciam festucam de oculo tuo et ecce trabis est in oculo tuo. hypocrita eice primum trabem de oculo tuo et tunc videbis eicere festucam de oculo fratris tui* (Mt. 7:3–5; cf. Lk. 6:41–42). He applies this biblical text to his enemies on three other occasions (*apol. c. Ruf.* 1.31, *epist.* 45.4.2, 50.1.2). Julian Pomerius recommends much the same strategy as Jer. for reproving sinners: *at si non ex iactantia sed ex misericordia et cum quadam pietate compatiens animi castigemus et illi nos sentiant non minus peccatis suis moveri quam nostris, aut in bonum statum reformati nobiscum deo gratias agunt, aut si eos in peccato tenet adhuc peccandi dulcedo et salutem suam nobis curae esse cernentes malum reddere pro bono voluerint, malle debemus eorum inimicitias qui noluerint emendari contrahere quam dei offensam dum peccantes palpamus incurrere* (v. cont. 3.23.2; incidentally, in the last part of this passage we may perhaps detect an echo of Jer.'s remark at *epist.* 108.25.4 regarding Paula's opposition to heretics: *quae maluit inimicitias hominum subire perpetuas quam dei offensam amicitias noxiis provocare*).

*nullum laesi, nullus saltem descriptione signatus est, neminem specialiter meus sermo pulsavit* This impressive tricolon crescens (syllabic ratio of 4:13:15) combines alliteration and anaphoric *disiunctio* (*nullum ... nullus ... neminem*). It opens with all of the implied force of apostolic authority, with an evocation of St. Paul; cf. 2 Cor. 7:2 *neminem laesimus, neminem corruptimus, neminem circumvenimus* (Hilberg missed this Pauline reference). St. Patrick (*conf.* 48) quoted the third leaf of this Pauline triptych when defending himself against his clerical critics.

Elsewhere Jer. also protests that he has not been personal in his attacks against vice; cf. *epist.* 27.2.1 *num quam amarior sermo pulsavit?*, 125.5.1 *ego neminem nominabo nec veteris comoediae licentia certas personas eligam atque perstringam*, 133.11.6 *nullius in hoc opusculo nomen proprie tangitur*. Sulpicius Severus, anticipating backlash for calling attention to the derelict

lifestyles of St. Martin's (non-ascetic) critics, likewise says: *nec vero quemquam nominari necesse est, licet nosmet ipsos plerique circumlatrent* (v. Mart. 24.7).

*generalis de vitiis disputatio est* At *epist.* 125.5.1 Jer. copies this phraseology (*generalis de vitiis disputatio*) in an identical context: to respond preemptively to cavilers who question his sincerity as a moralist. Cf. *comm. in Hier.* lib. 4, prol. 6 ll. 10–12 *cumque generaliter adversum vitia quid et haereticos dixerimus, se peti queruntur malumque conscientiae dissimulata dui indignatione pronuntiant, epist.* 79.8.1 *quaeso te, ne generalia monita et conveniens puellari sermo personae suspicionem tibi iniuriae moveant et arbitris me obiurgantis animo scribere, non timentis, cuius votum est te nescire, quae metuo.*

*qui mihi irasci voluerit, prius ipse de se quod talis sit confitetur* Jer. concludes his letter by advancing his customary argument in defense of his satiric technique: i.e. the only people who could possibly be aggravated with him are those guilty of the very vices he has described (cf. *epist.* 40.2.2–3, 125.5.1–2, 130.19.4, *adv. Iov.* 1.34). Sulpicius Severus closes his *Vita sancti Martini* in like manner (27.4 *sufficiet ut si qui ex his haec legerit et agnoverit, erubescat. nam si irascitur, de se dictum fatebitur, cum fortasse nos de aliis senserimus*). The approach had already been outlined by Cicero: *ego autem nomino neminem; quare irasci mihi nemo poterit, nisi qui ante de se voluerit confiteri* (*Manl.* 37). Ambrose says that the more a person seems offended by an allegation, the more culpable he makes himself look, and he accordingly recommends his priests, if they ever are wrongfully accused of something, make a point to face the charge with an even temperament (*off.* 1.22).





## BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ANCIENT AUTHORS

- Anonymous (Anon.), *Anthologia graeca* (*Anth. gr.*). H. Beckby, *Anthologia Graeca* (4 vols., Munich, 1965, 1968).
- , *Apophthegmata patrum* (*apoph. patr.*). PG 65:71–440.
- , *Constitutiones apostolorum* (*const. apost.*). F.X. Funk, *Didaskalia et constitutiones apostolorum*, vol. 1 (Paderborn, 1905).
- , *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* (*cons. Zacc. et Apoll.*). G. Morin, *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* (Bonn, 1935).
- , *Historia Augusta* (*hist. Aug.*). E. Hohl, *Scriptores historiae augustae* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1971).
- , *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* (*hist. mon.*). A.-J. Festugière, *Historia monachorum in Aegypto: Édition critique du texte grec et traduction annotée* (Brussels, 1971).
- , *Vita Alexandri Acemeti* (*v. Alex. Acem.*). E. de Stoop, *Vie d'Alexandre l'Acémète* (repr. Turnhout, 1971).
- , *Vita Danielis Stylitae* (*v. Dan. Styl.*). H. Delehay, *AB* 32 (1913): 121–229.
- , *Vita Hilarii Arelatensis* (*v. Hil. Arel.*). PL 50:1219–1246.
- , *Vita Olympiadis* (*v. Olymp.*). H. Delehay, *AB* 15 (1896): 400–423.
- , *Vita Pachomii* [*Graeca prima*] (*v. Pach.*). F. Halkin, *Sancti Pachomii vitae graecae* (Brussels, 1932).
- , *Vita Theodori Sykeotae* (*v. Theod. Syk.*). A.-J. Festugière, *Vie de Théodore de Sykéon* (Brussels, 1970).
- Ammianus Marcellinus (Amm. Marc.), *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt* (not abbreviated in text). W. Seyfarth, *Ammiani Marcellini rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt, adiuvantibus L.J.-Karau et I. Ulmann* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1978).
- Ambrose (Ambr.), *De apologia David ad Theodosium Augustum* (*apol. Dav.*). CSEL 32/2:299–355.
- , *De bono mortis* (*bon. mort.*). CSEL 32/1:703–753.
- , *De Cain et Abel* (*Cain et Abel*). CSEL 32/1:339–409.
- , *Epistulae* (*epist.*). CSEL 82/1–3.
- , *Epistulae extra collectionem traditae* (*epist. ex coll.*). CSEL 82/3:145–190, 198–295, 302–311.
- , *De excessu fratris Satyri* (*exc. Sat.*). CSEL 73:209–325.
- , *Exhortatio virginitatis* (*exh. virg.*). F. Gori, *Biblioteca Ambrosiana*, 14/2 (Milan, 1989), 198–270.
- , *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* (*exp. Luc.*). CCSL 14:1–400.
- , *Explanatio psalmorum XII* (*exp. Ps.*). CSEL 64.
- , *De fide* (*fid.*). CSEL 78:3–307.
- , *De Helia et ieunio* (*Hel. et ieun.*). CSEL 32/2:411–465.
- , *Hexameron* (*hex.*). CSEL 32/1:3–261.
- , *De Iacob et vita beata* (*Iac. et vit. beat.*). CSEL 32/2:3–70.
- , *De incarnationis dominicae sacramento* (*inc. dom.*). CSEL 79:225–281.

- , *De Ioseph (Ios.)*. CSEL 32/2:73–122.
- , *De Isaac vel anima (Is.)*. CSEL 32/1:641–700.
- , *De mysteriis (myst.)*. CSEL 73:89–116.
- , *De Nabuthae (Nab.)*. CSEL 32/2:469–516.
- , *De obitu Theodosii (obit. Theod.)*. CSEL 73:371–401.
- , *De obitu Valentiniani (obit. Valent.)*. CSEL 73:329–367.
- , *De officiis (off.)*. CCSL 15.
- , *De paenitentia (paen.)*. R. Gryson, *Ambroise de Milan: La pénitence* (Paris, 1971).
- , *De paradiso (parad.)*. CSEL 32/1:263–336.
- , *De virginibus (virg.)*. F. Gori, *Biblioteca Ambrosiana*, 14/1 (Milan, 1989), 100–240.
- Anaximenes (Anax.), *Ars rhetorica (rhet.)*. M. Fuhrmann, *Anaximenis ars rhetorica* (Leipzig, 1966).
- Apuleius (Apul.), *Apologia (apol.)*. R. Helm, *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis, Pro se de magia liber (Apologia)* (Leipzig, 1912).
- , *Metamorphoses (met.)*. R. Helm, *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis, Metamorphoses* (repr. Leipzig, 1955).
- Aristophanes (Arist.), *Nubes (nub.)*. N.G. Wilson, *Aristophanis fabulae* (Oxford, 2007), 137–202.
- Arrian (Arr.), *Epictetus' Discourses (Epict.)*. W.A. Oldfather, *Epictetus: Discourses* (London, 1925–1928).
- Asterius of Amasia (Aster. Amas.), *Liber ad Renatum monachum (ad Ren.)*. R. Jakobi, *Asterius, Liber ad Renatum monachum* (Berlin, 2011).
- , *Homiliae (hom.)*. C. Datema, *Asterius of Amasea, Homilies i–xiv* (Leiden, 1970).
- Athanasius (Athan.), *Vita Antoni (v. Ant.)*. G.J.M. Bartelink, *Athanase d'Alexandre, Vie d'Antoine* (Paris, 2004).
- Athenaeus (Athen.), *Deipnosophistae (deipn.)*. G. Kaibel, *Athenaei Naucratis deipnosophistarum libri XV* (3 vols., repr. Stuttgart, 1965–1966).
- Augustine (Aug.), *Adnotationes in Iob (adnot. in Iob)*. CSEL 28/2:509–628.
- , *De agone christiano (ag. chr.)*. CSEL 41:101–138.
- , *De baptismo (bapt.)*. CSEL 51:145–375.
- , *De beata vita (beat. vit.)*. CCSL 29:65–85.
- , *De bono coniugali (bon. coniug.)*. CSEL 41:187–230.
- , *Contra Academicos (c. Acad.)*. CCSL 29:3–61.
- , *Contra Faustum (c. Faust.)*. CSEL 25:251–797.
- , *Contra Iulianum (c. Iul.)*. PL 44:641–874.
- , *Contra litteras Petilianus (c. litt. Pet.)*. CSEL 52:3–227.
- , *De civitate dei (civ. dei)*. CCSL 47, 48.
- , *Confessiones (conf.)*. CCSL 27.
- , *De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum (div. quaest. ad Simp.)*. CCSL 44.
- , *De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus (div. quaest. oct. trib.)*. CCSL 44A:11–249.
- , *De doctrina christiana (doctr. chr.)*. CCSL 32:1–167.
- , *Enarrationes in Psalmos (enarr. in Ps.)*. CCSL 38, 39, 40.
- , *Epistulae (epist.)*. CSEL 34/1, 34/2, 44, 57, 58.
- , *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae (mor. eccl. cath.)*. PL 32:1309–1378.

- , *De natura et origine animae* (*nat. orig. an.*). CSEL 60:303–419.
- , *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* (*nupt. conc.*). CSEL 42:211–319.
- , *Ordo monasterii* (*ord. mon.*). L. Verheijen, *La règle de saint Augustin*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1967), 417–437.
- , *De patientia* (*pat.*). CSEL 41:663–691.
- , *Praeceptum* (*praec.*). L. Verheijen, *La règle de saint Augustin*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1967), 417–437.
- , *Quaestionum in heptateuchum libri septem* (*quaest. in hept.*). CCSL 33.
- , *Retractationes* (*retract.*). CCSL 57.
- , *Sermones* (*serm.*). CCSL 41; PL 38, 39; PLSupp 2; Schr 111.
- , *Speculum* (*spec.*). CSEL 12:3–285.
- , *Tractatus in Iohannem* (*tract. in Ioh.*). CCSL 36.
- , *De trinitate* (*trin.*). CCSL 50, 50A.
- , *De utilitate credendi* (*util. cred.*). CSEL 25:3–48.
- , *De utilitate ieiunii* (*util. ieiun.*). CCSL 46:231–241.
- , *De sancta virginitate* (*virg.*). CSEL 41:235–302.
- Aulus Gellius (Aul. Gell.), *Noctes Atticae* (*noct. Att.*). C. Hosius, *Aulus Gellius, Noctes Atticae* (Leipzig, 1903).
- Aurelius Victor (Aurel. Vict.), *Historiae abbreviatae* (*hist. abbrev.*). F. Pichlmayr, *Aurelius Victor Afer, Historiae abbreviatae* (Leipzig, 1911), 77–129.
- Ausonius (Aus.), *Epigrammata* (*epigr.*). S. Prete, *Decimi Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis opuscula* (Leipzig, 1978), 286–329.
- Basil (Bas.), *Epistulae* (*epist.*). Y. Courtonne, *Saint Basile, Lettres* (3 vols., Paris, 1957, 1961, 1966).
- , *Homilia in divites* (*hom. ad div.*). Y. Courtonne, *Saint Basile, Homélie sur la richesse* (Paris, 1935), 39–71.
- , *Homilia de invidia* (*hom. de inv.*). PG 31:372–385.
- , *Regulae fusius tractatae* (*reg. fus.*). PG 31:901–1052.
- Boethius (Boeth.), *Consolatio philosophiae* (*cons. phil.*). CCSL 94.
- Caesar (Caes.), *Commentarii belli civilis* (*bell. civ.*). A. Klotz, *C. Iulius Caesar, Commentarii belli civilis* (Leipzig, 1950).
- Caesarius of Arles (Caes. Arel.), *Sermones* (*serm.*). CCSL 103, 104.
- , *Statuta virginum* (*stat. virg.*). C. Morin, *S. Caesarii Arelatensis episcopi regula sanctorum virginum aliaque opuscula ad sanctimoniales directa* (Bonn, 1933), 6–17.
- Cassiodorus (Cassiod.), *Institutiones divinae* (*inst. div.*). R.A.B. Mynors, *Cassiodori senatoris Institutiones* (Oxford, 1961).
- Catullus (Catull.), *Carmina* (*carm.*). H. Bardon, *Catulli Veronensis carmina* (Leipzig, 1973).
- Celsus (Cels.), *De medicina* (*medic.*). C. Daremberg, *Cornelii Celsi De medicina libri octo* (Leipzig, 1891).
- Cicero (Cic.), *Laelius de amicitia* (*amic.*). K. Simbek, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 47* (Leipzig, 1917), 46–86.
- , *Brutus* (*Brut.*). E. Malcovati, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 4* (Leipzig, 1970).
- , *Pro Caelio oratio* (*Cael.*). T. Maslowski, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 23* (Leipzig, 1995), 51–149.

- , *Pro Cluentio oratio* (Cluent.). L. Fruechtel, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 15 (Leipzig, 1931), 37–140.
- , *De divinatione* (divin.). R. Giomini, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 46 (Leipzig, 1975), 1–148.
- , *Epistulae ad Atticum* (epist. ad Att.). D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae ad Atticum* (Leipzig, 1987).
- , *Epistulae ad familiares* (epist. ad fam.). D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero: Epistulae ad familiares* (2 vols., Cambridge, 2004).
- , *De finibus bonorum et malorum* (fin.). T. Schiche, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 43 (Leipzig, 1915).
- , *Pro Fonteio oratio* (Font.). F. Schoell, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 4 (Leipzig, 1923), 25–47.
- , *De legibus* (leg.). C.F.W. Müller, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 4/2 (Leipzig, 1905), 381–449.
- , *Pro lege Manlia* (Manl.). P. Reis, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 14 (Leipzig, 1927), 3–34.
- , *Pro Murena oratio* (Mur.). H. Kasten, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 18 (Leipzig, 1972).
- , *De natura deorum* (nat. deo.). W. Ax, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 45 (Leipzig, 1933).
- , *De officiis* (off.). C. Atzert, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 48 (Leipzig, 1963).
- , *De oratore* (orat.). K. Kumaniecki, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 3 (Leipzig, 1995).
- , *Partitiones oratoriae* (part. orat.). W. Friedrich, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 1/2 (Leipzig, 1972), 389–424.
- , *In M. Antonium orationes Philippicae* (Phil.). P. Fedeli, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 28 (Leipzig, 1986), 1–183.
- , *Pro Quinctio* (Quinc.). M.D. Reeve, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 7 (Leipzig, 1992), 1–50.
- , *De re publica* (rep.). K. Ziegler, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 39 (Leipzig, 1969).
- , *Pro Roscio oratio* (Rosc.). J. Axer, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 9 (Leipzig, 1976), 1–19.
- , *Cato maior de senectute* (senect.). K. Simbeck, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 47 (Leipzig, 1917), 3–43.
- , *Pro Sestio oratio* (Sest.). T. Maslowski, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 22 (Leipzig, 1986), 4–78.
- , *Pro Sulla oratio* (Sull.). H. Kasten, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 19 (Leipzig, 1966), 1–29.
- , *Tusculanae disputationes* (Tusc. disp.). M. Pohlenz, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 44 (Leipzig, 1918).
- , *In C. Verrem orationes* (Verr.). A. Klotz, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, fasc. 5 (Leipzig, 1923), 34–350, 2b–172b.
- Clement of Alexandria (Clem. Alex.), *Paedagogus* (paed.). M. Harl, H.-I. Marrou, C. Matray, and C. Mondésert, *Clément d'Alexandrie, Le pédagogue* (3 vols., Paris, 1960, 1965, 1970).

- , *Quis dives salvetur (quis div. salv.)*. L. Früchtel, O. Stählin, and U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. 3 (Berlin, 1970), 159–191.
- , *Stromata (strom.)*. L. Früchtel, O. Stählin, and U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vols. 2 & 3 (Berlin, 1960, 1970), 2.3–518, 3.3–102.
- Cornelius Nepos (Corn. Nep.), *De viris illustribus (vir. ill.)*. P.K. Marshall, *Cornelii Nepotis vitae cum fragmentis* (Leipzig, 1977).
- Cyprian (Cyp.), *Ad Quirinum (ad Quir.)*. CCL 3:3–179.
- , *De bono patientiae (bon. pat.)*. CCL 3A:118–133.
- , *De dominica oratione (dom. orat.)*. CCL 3A:90–113.
- , *Ad Donatum (Don.)*. CCL 3A:3–13.
- , *Epistulae (epist.)*. CCL 3B, 3C.
- , *De habitu virginum (hab. virg.)*. CSEL 3/1:187–205.
- , *De mortalitate (mort.)*. CCL 3A:17–32.
- , *De opere et eleemosynis (op. et eleem.)*. CCL 3A:55–72.
- , *De zelo et livore (zel. et liv.)*. CCL 3A:75–86.
- Cyril of Alexandria (Cyr. Alex.), *Contra Iulianum (c. Iul.)*. P. Burguière and P. Éviex, *Cyrille d'Alexandrie, Contre Julien* (Paris, 1985), 100–318.
- , *Commentarius in Isaïam (comm. in Is.)*. PG 70:9–1449.
- , *Expositio in Psalmos (exp. in Ps.)*. PG 69:717–1273.
- Cyril of Jerusalem (Cyr. Jer.), *Catecheses ad illuminandos 1–18 (cat.)*. W.C. Reischl and J. Rupp, *Cyriilli Hierosolymorum archiepiscopi opera quae supersunt omnia* (2 vols., repr. Hildesheim, 1967), 1:28–320, 2:2–342.
- , *Homilia in paralyticum iuxta piscinam iacentem (hom. in paralyt.)*. W.C. Reischl and J. Rupp, *Cyriilli Hierosolymorum archiepiscopi opera quae supersunt omnia*, vol. 2 (repr. Hildesheim, 1967), 405–426.
- , *Mystagogiae (cat. myst.)*. P. Paris and A. Piedagnel, *Cyrille de Jérusalem, Catéchèses mystagogiques* (Paris, 1966), 82–174.
- Cyril of Scythopolis (Cyr. Scyth.), *Vita Euthymii (v. Euth.)*. E. Schwartz, *Kyrrillos von Skythopolis* (Leipzig, 1939), 2–85.
- Didymus (Didym.), *Commentarius in Zachariam (comm. in Zach.)*. L. Doutreleau, *Didyme l'Aveugle sur Zacharie* (3 vols., Paris, 1962), 83.190–412, 84.426–788, 85.802–1086.
- Dio Chrysostom (Dio. Chrys.), *Orationes (orat.)*. J. von Arnim, *Dionis Prusaensis quem vocant Chrysostomum quae exstant omnia*, vols. 1–2 (repr. Berlin, 1962), 1.1–338, 2.1–306.
- Diogenes Laertius (Diog. Laert.), *Vitae philosophorum (v. phil.)*. H.S. Long, *Diogenis Laertii vitae philosophorum* (2 vols., Oxford, 1964), 1.1–246, 2.247–565.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Dion. Hal.), *De Isocrate (Isoc.)*. L. Radermacher and H. Usener, *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant*, vol. 5 (repr. Stuttgart, 1965), 54–92.
- Egeria (Eger.), *Itinerarium (itin.)*. P. Maraval, *Égérie, Journal de voyage (Itinéraire); Valerius du Bierzo, Lettre sur Égérie* (Paris, 1997).
- Eucherius (Eucher.), *Instructiones ad Salonium (instr. Sal.)*. CCL 66:77–216.
- Eusebius (Eus.), *Demonstratio evangelica (dem. ev.)*. I.A. Heikel, *Eusebius Werke, Band 6: Die Demonstratio evangelica* (Leipzig, 1913).
- , *Historia ecclesiastica (hist. eccl.)*. G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire ecclésiastique* (3 vols., Paris, 1952, 1955, 1958).

- , *Vita Constantini* (v. Cons.). F. Winkelmann, *Eusebius Werke, Band 1.1: Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin* (Berlin, 1975).
- Evagrius Ponticus (Evag. Pont.), *Sententiae ad virginem* (sent. virg.). H. Gressmann, *Nonnenspiegel und Mönchsspiegel des Evagrius Pontikos* (Leipzig, 1913), 146–151.
- Florus (Flor.), *Epitoma de Tito Livio* (epit. Tit. Liv.). O. Rossbach, *Epitoma de Tito Livio L. Annaei Flori epitomae libri II* (Leipzig, 1896).
- Fronto (Front.), *Epistulae* (epist.). M.P.J. van den Hout, *M. Cornelii Frontonis epistulae* (Leipzig, 1988).
- Fulgentius (Fulg.), *Mitologiae* (mit.). R. Helm, *Fabii Planciadis Fulgentii opera* (Leipzig, 1970), 3–80.
- Gerontios (Geront.), *Vita Melaniae iunioris* (v. Mel.). D. Gorce, *Vie de Sainte Mélanie* (Paris, 1962).
- Gregory of Elvira (Greg. Elv.), *Commentarius in Canticum canticorum* (comm. in Cant.). CCL 69:169–210.
- , *Tractatus in libris sanctarum scripturarum* (tract. sanc. script.). CCL 69:5–146.
- Gregory the Great (Greg. Magn.), *Dialogi* (dial.). A. de Vogüé, *Grégoire le Grand, Dialogues* (3 vols., Paris, 1978–1980).
- , *Epistulae* (epist.). CCL 140, 140A.
- , *Regula pastoralis* (reg. past.). CCL 141.
- Gregory of Nazianzus (Greg. Naz.), *Carmina de seipso* (carm. de se ipso). PG 37:969–1029, 1166–1452.
- , *De vita sua* (de vita sua). C. Jungck, *Gregor von Nazianz, De vita sua* (Heidelberg, 1974).
- , *Orationes* (orat.). J. Bernardi, *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours* (Paris, 1978–1995).
- Gregory of Nyssa (Greg. Nys.), *In baptismum Christi oratio* (bapt. Chr.). E. Gebhardt, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, vol. 9.1 (Leiden, 1967), 221–242.
- , *Epistulae* (epist.). G. Pasquali, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, vol. 8.2 (Leiden, 1959), 3–95.
- , *Homiliae in Canticum canticorum* (hom. in Cant.). H. Langerbeck, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, vol. 6 (Leiden, 1960), 3–469.
- , *Homiliae de opificio hominis* (hom. op.). PG 44:124–256.
- , *Laudatio sancti Theodori* (laud. Theod.). PG 46:736–748.
- , *Oratio consolatoria in Pulcheriam* (orat. cons. in Pulch.). A. Spira, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, vol. 9.1 (Leiden, 1967), 461–472.
- , *Oratio funebris in Meletium* (orat. fun. in Melet.). A. Spira, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, vol. 9.1 (Leiden, 1967), 441–457.
- , *De vita Gregorii Thaumaturgi* (v. Greg. Thaum.). PG 46:893–957.
- , *Vita Macrinae* (v. Macr.). P. Maraval, *Grégoire de Nysse, Vie de sainte Macrine* (Paris, 1971), 136–266.
- , *De vita Mosis* (v. Moys.). J. Danielou, *Grégoire de Nysse, La vie de Moïse* (Paris, 1968).
- , *De virginitate* (virg.). M. Aubineau, *Grégoire de Nysse, Traité de la virginité* (Paris, 1966).
- Gregory Thaumaturgus (Greg. Thaum.), *Metaphrasis in Ecclesiasten Salamonis* (met. in Eccl.). PG 10:988–1017.

- , *Oratio panegyrica in Origenem* (orat. pan. in Orig.). H. Crouzel, *Grégoire le Thaumaturge, Remerciement à Origène suivi de la lettre d'Origène à Grégoire* (Paris, 1969), 94–182.
- Gregory of Tours (Greg. Tur.), *Liber in gloria martyrum* (glor. mart.). MGH SRM 1/2:34–111.
- Hilary of Poitiers (Hil.), *Tractatus in Psalmos* (tract. in Ps.). CCSL 61, 61A.
- Homer (Hom.), *Iliad* (Il.). T.W. Allen, *Homeri Ilias*, vols. 2–3 (Oxford, 1931).
- , *Odyssey* (Od.). P. von der Mühl, *Homeri Odyssea* (Basel, 1962).
- Horace (Hor.), *Carmina* (carm.). D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Q. Horati Flacci opera* (Stuttgart, 1995), 1–134.
- , *Epistulae* (epist.). D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Q. Horati Flacci opera* (Stuttgart, 1995), 251–309.
- , *Epodi* (epod.). D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Q. Horati Flacci opera* (Stuttgart, 1995), 139–164.
- , *Sermones* (serm.). D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Q. Horati Flacci opera* (Stuttgart, 1995), 165–250.
- Hostius (Host.), *Carminis belli histicri fragmenta* (frag. 3). J. Blänsdorf, *Fragmenta poetarum latinorum* (Leipzig, 1995), 77–78.
- Ignatius (Ign.), *Epistula ad Ephesios* (epist. ad Eph.). P.T. Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche. Polycarpe de Smyrne. Lettres. Martyre de Polycarpe* (Paris, 1969).
- , *Epistula ad Polycarpum* (epist. ad Polyc.). Camelot, *ibid.*
- , *Epistula ad Romanos* (epist. ad Rom.). Camelot, *ibid.*
- Irenaeus (Iren.), *Adversus haereses* (adv. haer.). L. Doutreleau and A. Rousseau, *Irénee de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, livre 3* (Paris, 1974); L. Doutreleau, B.C. Mercier, and A. Rousseau, *Irénee de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, livre 5* (Paris, 1969); L. Doutreleau and A. Rousseau, *Irénee de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, livre 3* (Paris, 1974); L. Doutreleau, B. Hemmerdinger, B.C. Mercier, and A. Rousseau, *Irénee de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, livre 4* (Paris, 1965); L. Doutreleau, B.C. Mercier, and A. Rousseau, *Irénee de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, livre 5* (Paris, 1969); W.W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis libri quinque adversus haereses*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1857).
- Isidore of Pelusium (Isid. Pel.), *Epistulae* (epist.). P. Évieux, *Isidore de Péluse, Lettres* (2 vols., Paris, 1997, 2000).
- Isidore of Seville (Isid. Sev.), *De ecclesiasticis officiis* (eccl. off.). CCSL 113.
- , *Etymologiae* (etym.). W.M. Lindsay, *Isidori Etymologiarum libri XX* (2 vols., Oxford, 1911).
- Isocrates (Isocr.), *Orationes* (orat.). É. Brémond and G. Mathieu, *Isocrate, Discours* (4 vols., Paris, 1966–1967).
- Jerome (Jer.), *Adversus Iovinianum* (adv. Iov.). PL 23:221–352.
- , *Apologia contra Rufinum* (apol. c. Ruf.). CCSL 79.
- , *Altercatio Luciferiani et orthodoxi* (alt. Luc. orth.). A. Canellis, *Jérôme, Débat entre un Luciférien et un orthodoxe* (*Altercatio Luciferiani et orthodoxi*) (Paris, 2003).
- , *Contra Helvidium* (c. Helv.). PL 23:193–216.
- , *Contra Iohannem* (c. Ioh.). CCSL 79A.
- , *Commentarius in Abacuc* (comm. in Abac.). CCSL 76A:579–654.
- , *Commentarius in Abdiam* (comm. in Abd.). CCSL 76:349–374.



- , *Commentarius in Amos* (comm. in Am.). CCSL 76:211–348.
- , *Commentarius in Daniele* (comm. in Dan.). CCSL 75A.
- , *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten* (comm. in Eccl.). CCSL 72:249–361.
- , *Commentarius in epistolam ad Ephesios* (comm. in Eph.). PL 26:467–590.
- , *Commentarius in epistolam ad Galatas* (comm. in Gal.). CCSL 77A.
- , *Commentarius in Hieremiam* (comm. in Hier.). CCSL 74.
- , *Commentarius in Hiezechelem* (comm. in Hiez.). CCSL 75.
- , *Commentarius in Ioelem* (comm. in Ioel.). CCSL 76:159–209.
- , *Commentarius in Isaia* (comm. in Is.). CCSAL 73, 73A.
- , *Commentarius in Michaeam* (comm. in Mich.). CCSL 76:421–524.
- , *Commentarius in Matthaum* (comm. in Mt.). CCSL 77.
- , *Commentarius in Naum* (comm. in Naum). CCSL 76A:525–578.
- , *Commentarius in Osee* (comm. in Os.). CCSL 76:1–158.
- , *Commentarius in Philemonem* (comm. in Phlm.). CCSL 77C.
- , *Commentarius in Sophoniam* (comm. in Soph.). CCSL 76A:655–711.
- , *Commentarius in Zachariam* (comm. in Zach.). CCSL 76A:747–900.
- , *Commentarioli in Psalmos* (commentariol. in Ps.). CCSL 72:177–245.
- , *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos* (dial. adv. Pel.). CCSL 80.
- , *Epistulae* (epist.). CSEL 54–56.
- , *Epistula adversus Rufinum* (epist. adv. Ruf.). CCSL 79:73–116.
- , *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum* (hebr. nom.). CCSL 72:59–161.
- , *Homilia de nativitate domini* (hom. de native. dom.). CCSL 78:524–529.
- , *Onomasticon* (onom.). R. Helm, *Eusebius' Werke 7: Die Chronik des Hieronymus* (Berlin, 1956).
- , *Liber quaestionum hebraicarum in Genesim* (quaest. hebr. in Gen.). CCSL 72:1–56.
- , *Tractatus de die epiphaniarum* (tract. de die epiph.). CCSL 78:530–532.
- , *Tractatus in Marci evangelium* (tract. in Marc.). CCSL 78:451–500.
- , *Tractatus in Psalmos* (tract. in Ps.). CCSL 78:3–352.
- , *Translatio Didymi de spiritu sancto* (transl. Didym. spir. sanc.). L. Doutreleau, *Didyme l'Aveugle, Traité du Saint-Esprit* (Paris, 1992).
- , *Translatio regulae Pachomii* (transl. reg. Pachom.). PL 23:61–86.
- , *Vita Hilarionis* (v. Hilar.). P. Leclerc and E. Martín Morales, *Jérôme, Trois vies de moines* (Paul, Malchus, Hilarion) (Paris, 2007), 212–299.
- , *Vita Malchi monachi captivi* (v. Mal.). P. Leclerc and E. Martín Morales, *Jérôme, Trois vies de moines* (Paul, Malchus, Hilarion) (Paris, 2007), 184–211.
- , *Vita Pauli eremitae* (v. Paul.). P. Leclerc and E. Martín Morales, *Jérôme, Trois vies de moines* (Paul, Malchus, Hilarion) (Paris, 2007), 144–183.
- , *De viris illustribus* (vir. ill.). A. Ceresa-Gastaldo, *Gerolamo, Gli uomini illustri* (De viris illustribus) (Florence, 1988).
- John Cassian (John Cass.), *Collationes* (coll.). CSEL 13.
- , *De incarnatione domini* (inc. dom.). CSEL 17:235–391.
- , *De institutis coenobiorum* (inst.). CSEL 17:3–231.
- John Chrysostom (John Chrys.), *Ad populum Antiochenum* (homiliae 1–21) (ad pop. Antioch. hom.). PG 49:15–222.
- , *Ad viduam iuniorem* (ad vid. iun.). G.H. Ettlinger and B. Grillet, *Jean Chrysostome, A une jeune veuve, Sur le mariage unique* (Paris, 1968), 112–159.

- , *De baptismo Christi* (*bapt. Chr.*). PG 49:363–372.
- , *De sancto Babyla* (*de sanc. Babyl.*). PG 50:527–534.
- , *Epistulae ad Olympiadem* (*epist. Olymp.*). A.-M. Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome, Lettres à Olympias* (Paris, 1968).
- , *In Eutropium* (*Eutrop.*). PG 52:391–396.
- , *Expositiones in Psalmos* (*exp. in Ps.*). PG 55:39–498.
- , *Quod regulares feminae viris cohabitare non debeant* (*fem. reg.*). J. Dumortier, *Saint Jean Chrysostome, Les cohabitations suspectes* (Paris, 1955).
- , *Homiliae de paenitentia* (*hom. de paen.*). PG 49:277–350.
- , *Homiliae in Acta apostolorum* (*hom. in Act.*). PG 60:13–384.
- , *Homiliae in epistulam ad Colossenses* (*hom. in Col.*). PG 62:299–392.
- , *Homiliae in epistulam 1 ad Corinthios* (*hom. in 1 Cor.*). PG 61:9–382.
- , *Homiliae in epistulam ad Ephesios* (*hom. in Eph.*). PG 62:9–176.
- , *Homiliae in Genesim* (*hom. in Gen.*). PG 53:21–385; 54:385–580.
- , *Homiliae in epistulam ad Hebraeos* (*hom. in Hebr.*). PG 63:9–236.
- , *Homilia in Ignatium martyrem* (*hom. in Ign. mart.*). PG 50:587–596.
- , *Homiliae in Iohannem* (*hom. in Ioh.*). PG 59:23–482.
- , *Homilia in Meletium Antiochenum* (*hom. in Melet.*). PG 50:515–520.
- , *Homiliae in Matthaeum* (*hom. in Mt.*). PG 57:13–472; 58:471–794.
- , *Homilia in paralyticum demissum per tectum* (*hom. in paralyt. demis. per tect.*). PG 51:47–64.
- , *Homiliae in epistulam ad Philippenses* (*hom. in Phil.*). PG 62:177–298.
- , *Homiliae in epistulam 1 ad Thessalonicenses* (*hom. in 1 Thess.*). PG 62:391–468.
- , *In martyres Aegyptios* (*in mart. Aegypt.*). PG 50:693–698.
- , *Homiliae in principium Actorum apostolorum* (*in princ. Act.*). PG 51:65–112.
- , *Quod nemo laeditur nisi a se ipso* (*quod nemo laed. nisi a se ipso*). A.-M. Malingrey, *Lettre d'exil à Olympias et à tous les fidèles* (Paris, 1964), 56–144.
- , *De sacerdotio* (*sacerd.*). A.-M. Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome, Sur le sacerdoce* (Paris, 1980).
- , *Homiliae de statu* (*stat.*). PG 49:15–222.
- , *De virginitate* (*virg.*). B. Grillet and H. Musurillo, *Jean Chrysostome, La virginité* (Paris, 1966).
- Josephus (Jos.), *Antiquitates Iudaicae* (*ant.*). B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi opera*, vols. 1–4 (repr. Berlin, 1955).
- Julian of Eclanum (Jul. Ecl.), *Tractatus Amos* (*tract. in Am.*). CCL 88:115–329.
- Julian Pomerius (Jul. Pom.), *De vita contemplativa* (*v. cont.*). PL 59:411–520.
- Justin Martyr (Just. Mart.), *Apologia* (*apol.*). E.J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen, 1915), 26–77.
- Juvenal (Juv.), *Saturae* (*sat.*). W.V. Clausen, *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis satirae* (Oxford, 1992).
- Juvencus (Iuenc.), *Evangeliorum libri IV* (*evang.*). CSEL 24.
- Lactantius (Lact.), *Divinae institutiones* (*div. inst.*). CSEL 19.
- , *De opificio dei* (*op. dei*). CSEL 27/1:4–64.
- Leo the Great, *Sermones* (*serm.*). CCL 138, 138A.
- Livy (Liv.), *Ab urbe condita* (*a.u.c.*). R.M. Ogilvy, *Titi Livi Ab urbe condita, Volume I: Books I–V* (Oxford, 1974).

- R.S. Conway and C.F. Walters, *Titi Livi Ab urbe condita, Volume II: Books VI–X* (Oxford, 1993).
- R.S. Conway and C.F. Walters, *Titi Livi Ab urbe condita, Volume III: Books XXI–XXV* (Oxford, 1993).
- R.S. Conway and C.F. Walters, *Titi Livi Ab urbe condita, Volume IV: Books XXVI–XXX* (Oxford, 1993).
- A.H. McDonald, *Titi Livi Ab urbe condita, Volume V: Books XXXI–XXXV* (Oxford, 1965).
- P.G. Walsh, *Titi Livi Ab urbe condita, Volume VI: Books XXXI–XL* (Oxford, 1999).
- Lucan (Luc.), *Pharsalia (Phars.)*. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili libri decem* (Leipzig, 1997).
- Lucian, *Dialogi mortuorum (dial. mort.)*. M.D. Macleod, *Lucian*, vol. 7 (Cambridge, Mass., 1961), 2–174.
- , *Macrobii (macr.)*. A.M. Harmon, *Lucian*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1961), 222–244.
- Lucretius (Lucr.), *De rerum natura (rer. nat.)*. C. Bailey, *Titi Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex* (Oxford, 1922).
- Macrobius (Macrob.), *Saturnalia (Saturn.)*. J. Willis, *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobiani Saturnalia* (Leipzig 1963).
- Martial (Mart.), *Epigrammata (epigr.)*. W.M. Lindsay, *M. Val. Martialis Epigrammata* (Oxford, 1922).
- Maximus of Turin (Max. Taur.), *Sermones (serm.)*. CCSL 23.
- Nilus of Ancyra (Nil. Anc.), *Epistulae (epist.)*. PG 79:82–582.
- , *De monastica exercitatione (monast. exercit.)*. PG 79:720–809.
- Novatian (Novat.), *De cibis iudaicis (cib. iud.)*. CCSL 4:89–101.
- Origen (Orig.), *Contra Celsum (c. Cels.)*. M. Borret, *Origène, Contre Celse* (4 vols., Paris, 1967–1969).
- , *Commentarius in Canticum canticorum (comm. in Cant.)*. W.A. Baehrens, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 8 (Leipzig, 1925).
- , *Commentarius in Matthaeum (comm. in Mt.)*. E. Klostermann, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 11 (Leipzig, 1933).
- , *Commentarius in Iohannem (comm. in Ioh.)*. E. Preuschen, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 4 (Leipzig, 1903), 298–480.
- , *Exhortatio ad martyrium (exh. ad mart.)*. P. Koetschau, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1899), 3–47.
- , *Commentarius in Cantica canticorum (comm. in Cant.)*. L. Brésard, H. Crouzel, and M. Borret, *Origène, Commentaire sur le Cantique des cantiques* (Paris, 1991).
- , *Homiliae in Canticum canticorum (hom. in Cant.)*. O. Rousseau, *Origène, Homélies sur le Cantique des cantiques* (Paris, 1991).
- , *Homiliae in Genesim (hom. in Gen.)*. P. Habermehl, *Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung. Teil 1: Die Homilien zu Genesis (Homiliae in Genesin)* (Berlin, 2012).
- , *Homiliae in Hieremiam (hom. in Hier.)*. P. Nautin, *Origène, Homélies sur Jérémie* (Paris, 1976).
- , *Homiliae in Iesu Nave (hom. in Ies.)*. W.A. Baehrens, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 7 (Leipzig, 1921).

- , *Homiliae in Iudices (hom. in Iud.)*. P. Messié, L. Neyrand, and M. Borret, *Origène, Homélie sur les Juges* (Paris, 1993).
- , *Homiliae in Leviticum (hom. in Lev.)*. W.A. Baehrens, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 6 (Leipzig, 1920).
- , *Homiliae in Lucam (hom. in Luc.)*. M. Rauer, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 9 (Berlin, 1959).
- , *Homiliae in Numeros (hom. in Num.)*. A. Méhat, *Origène, Homélie sur les Nombres* (Paris, 1951).
- Orosius (Oros.), *Liber apologeticus contra Pelagianos (c. Pel.)*. CSEL 5:603–664.
- , *Historiae adversum paganos (hist. adv. pag.)*. M.-P. Arnaud-Lindet, *Orose, Histoires (Contres les païens)* (3 vols., Paris, 1990–1991).
- Ovid (Ov.), *Amores (am.)*. E.J. Kenney, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris* (Oxford, 1994).
- , *Ars amatoria (ars. am.)*. E.J. Kenney, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris* (Oxford, 1994).
- , *Fasti (fast.)*. E.H. Alton, D.E.W. Wormell, and E. Courtney, *Ovidius, Fasti* (Leipzig, 1988).
- , *Heroides (her.)*. R. Ehwald, *Ovidius, Epistulae (Heroides)* (Leipzig, 1907).
- , *Ibis (Ib.)*. S.G. Owen, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium libri quinque, Ibis, Ex Ponto libri quattuor; Halieutica; Fragmenta* (Oxford, 1922).
- , *Metamorphoses (met.)*. R.J. Tarrant, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses* (Oxford, 2004).
- , *Epistulae ex Ponto (Pont.)*. S.G. Owen, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium libri quinque, Ibis, Ex Ponto libri quattuor; Halieutica; Fragmenta* (Oxford, 1922).
- , *Remedia amoris (rem. am.)*. E.J. Kenney, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris* (Oxford, 1994).
- , *Tristia (trist.)*. S.G. Owen, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium libri quinque, Ibis, Ex Ponto libri quattuor; Halieutica; Fragmenta* (Oxford, 1922).
- Palladius (Pall.), *Dialogus de vita Iohannis Chrysostomi (dial.)*. P.R. Coleman-Norton, *Palladii dialogus de vita S. Iohanni Chrysostomi* (Cambridge, 1928).
- , *Historia Lausiaca (hist. Laus.)*. G.J.M. Bartelink, *Palladio, La storia Lausiaca* (Verona, 1974).
- Patrick (Patr.), *Confessio (conf.)*. R.P.C. Hanson, *Confession et lettre à Coroticus* (Paris, 1978).
- Paulinus of Milan (Paul. Mil.), *Vita Ambrosii (v. Ambr.)*. A.A.R. Bastiaensen, *Vite dei santi*, vol. 3 (Milan, 1974), 54–124.
- Paulinus of Nola (Paul. Nol.), *Carmina (carm.)*. CSEL 30.
- , *Epistulae (epist.)*. CSEL 29, 34/1, 34/2.
- Pausanias (Paus.), *Graeciae descriptio (Gr. descr.)*. F. Spiro, *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio* (3 vols., repr. Leipzig, 1967).
- Persius (Pers.), *Saturae (sat.)*. W.V. Clausen, *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis saturae* (Oxford, 1992).
- Peter Chrysologus (Pet. Chrys.), *Sermones (serm.)*. CCSL 24, 24A, 24B.
- Petronius (Petron.), *Satyrice (Sat.)*. K. Müller, *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon reliquiae* (Stuttgart, 1995), 1–175.
- Phaedrus (Phaedr.), *Fabulae (fab.)*. L. Müller, *Phaedri Augusti liberti fabulae Aesopiae* (Leipzig, 1879).

- Philo (Phil.), *De somniis* (somm.). P. Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, vol. 3 (repr. Berlin, 1962), 204–306.
- , *De specialibus legibus* (spec. leg.). L. Cohn, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, vol. 5 (repr. Berlin, 1962), 1–265.
- , *De vita Mosis* (v. Mos.). L. Cohn, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, vol. 4 (repr. Berlin, 1962), 119–268.
- Philostratus (Philostr.), *Imagines* (imag.). O. Benndorf and K. Schenkl, *Philostrati maioris imagines* (Leipzig, 1893).
- , *Vita Apollonii* (v. Apoll.). C.L. Kayser, *Flavii Philostrati opera*, vol. 1 (repr. Hildesheim, 1964).
- , *Vitae sophistarum* (v. soph.). C.L. Kayser, *Flavii Philostrati opera*, vol. 2 (repr. Hildesheim, 1964).
- Plato (Plat.), *Laches* (Lach.). J. Burnet, *Platonis opera*, vol. 3 (repr. Oxford, 1968), II.178a–201c.
- , *Phaedrus* (Phaedr.). J. Burnet, *Platonis opera*, vol. 2 (repr. Oxford, 1967), III.227a–279c.
- , *Republic* (rep.). J. Burnet, *Platonis opera*, vol. 4 (repr. Oxford, 1968), II.327a–621d.
- Plautus (Plaut.), *Comoediae*. W.M. Lindsay, *Comoediae* (2 vols., Oxford, 1963).
- Pliny the Elder (Plin. mai.), *Naturalis historia* (nat. hist.). H. Rackham, W.H.S. Jones, and D.E. Eichholz, *Pliny, Natural History* (10 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1967–1975).
- Pliny the Younger (Plin. min.), *Epistulae* (epist.). M. Schuster, *Epistularum libri novem* (Leipzig, 1952).
- , *Panegyricus* (pan.). R.A.B. Mynors, *XII Panegyrici latini* (Oxford, 1964).
- Plutarch (Plut.), *Brutus* (Brut.). K. Ziegler, *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*, vol. 2.1 (Leipzig, 1964), 135–179.
- , *Cato* (Cat.). K. Ziegler, *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*, vol. 1.1 (Leipzig, 1969), 287–324.
- , *Moralia* (moral.). F.C. Babbitt, *Plutarch's Moralia* (2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1927–1928).
- Polycarp (Polyc.), *Epistula ad Philippenses* (epist. ad Php.). K. Bihlmeyer and W. Schneemelcher, *Die apostolischen Väter*, (Tübingen, 1970), 114–120.
- Pontius (Pont.), *Vita Cypriani* (v. Cyp.). A.A.R. Bastiaensen, *Vita di Cipriano, Vita di Ambrogio, Vita di Agostino* (Milan, 1975).
- Possidius (Poss.), *Vita Augustini* (v. Aug.). A.A.R. Bastiaensen, *Vita di Cipriano, Vita di Ambrogio, Vita di Agostino* (Milan, 1975).
- Propertius (Prop.), *Elegiae* (eleg.). P. Fedeli, *Sexti Properti elegiarum libri IV* (Leipzig, 1984).
- Prudentius (Prudent.), *Liber cathemerinon* (cath.). CCL 126:3–72.
- , *Liber peristephanon* (perist.). CCL 126:251–389.
- , *Psychomachia* (Psych.). CCL 126:149–181.
- Pseudo-Athanasius (Ps.-Athanas.), *De virginitate* (virg.). D. Brakke, *Pseudo-Athanasius on Virginitate* (Leuven, 2002).
- Pseudo-Augustine (Ps.-Aug.), *De sobrietate et castitate* (sobr. et cast.). PL 40:1105–1112.
- Pseudo-Cyprian (Ps.-Cyp.), *De singularitate clericorum* (sing. cler.). CSEL 3/3:173–220.

- Pseudo-Jerome (Ps.-Jer.), *De septem ordinibus ecclesiae* (*sept. ord. eccl.*). W. Kalff, *Ps.-Hieronymi, De septem ordinibus ecclesiae* (Würzburg, 1935).
- Pseudo-Nilus (Ps.-Nil.), *Narrationes* (*narr.*). F. Conca, *Nilus Ancyranus, Narratio* (Leipzig, 1983).
- Pseudo-Phocylides (Ps.-Phocyl.), *Sententiae* (*sent.*). D. Young, *Theognis* (Leipzig, 1971), 95–112.
- Pseudo-Quintilian (Ps.-Quint.), *Declamationes maiores* (*decl. mai.*). L. Håkanson, *Declamationes XIX maiores Quintiliano falso ascriptae* (Berlin, 1998).
- Pseudo-Tibullus (Ps.-Tibull.), *Elegiae* (*eleg.*). G. Luck, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carmina* (Leipzig, 1988), 96–102, 106–107.
- Quintilian (Quint.), *Institutio oratoria* (*inst. orat.*). M. Winterbottom, *Quintiliani Institutio oratoria* (Oxford, 1970).
- Quintus Curtius Rufus (Curt. Ruf.), *Historia Alexandri magni* (*hist. Alex.*). E. Hedicke, *Q. Curtii Rufi Historiarum Alexandri Magni Macedonis libri qui supersunt* (Leipzig, 1908).
- Rufinus (Ruf.), *Apologia contra Hieronymum* (*apol. c. Hier.*). CCL 20:37–123.
- , *De benedictionibus patriarcharum* (*bened. patr.*). CCL 20:189–228.
- , *Historia ecclesiastica* (*hist. eccl.*). T. Mommsen, *Corpus Berolinense*, vol. 9/2 (Berlin, 1908), 957–1040.
- , *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* (*hist. mon.*). E. Schulz-Flügel, *Tyrannius Rufinus, Historia monachorum sive De vita sanctorum patrum* (Berlin, 1990).
- , *Regula Basilii translatio* (*reg. Bas.*). PL 103:483–564.
- Sallust (Sall.), *Bellum Catilinae* (*bell. Cat.*). A. Kurfess, *C. Sallusti Crispi, Catilina; Iugurtha; Fragmenta ampliora* (Leipzig, 1957), 2–52.
- , *De bello Iugurthino* (*bell. Iug.*). A. Kurfess, *C. Sallusti Crispi, Catilina; Iugurtha; Fragmenta ampliora* (Leipzig, 1957), 53–147.
- Salvian (Salv.), *Ad ecclesiam sive adversus avaritiam* (*ad eccl.*). G. Lagarrigue, *Salvien de Marseille, Œuvres complètes, t. 1: Les lettres, les livres de Timothée à l'église* (Paris, 1971).
- , *De gubernatione dei* (*gub. dei*). G. Lagarrigue, *Salvien de Marseille, Œuvres complètes, t. 2: Du gouvernement de dieu* (Paris, 1975).
- Seneca (Sen.), *Agamemno* (*Agam.*). O. Zwierlein, *Seneca, Tragoediae* (Oxford, 1986).
- , *De beneficiis* (*ben.*). L.D. Reynolds, *L. Annaei Senecae dialogorum libri duodecim* (Oxford, 1977).
- , *De brevitate vitae* (*brev. vit.*). L.D. Reynolds, *L. Annaei Senecae dialogorum libri duodecim* (Oxford, 1977).
- , *Consolatio ad Helviam matrem* (*cons. ad Helv.*). L.D. Reynolds, *L. Annaei Senecae dialogorum libri duodecim* (Oxford, 1977).
- , *Consolatio ad Marciam* (*cons. ad Marc.*). L.D. Reynolds, *L. Annaei Senecae dialogorum libri duodecim* (Oxford, 1977).
- , *Consolatio ad Polybium* (*cons. ad Polyb.*). L.D. Reynolds, *L. Annaei Senecae dialogorum libri duodecim* (Oxford, 1977).
- , *De constantia sapientis* (*const. sap.*). L.D. Reynolds, *L. Annaei Senecae dialogorum libri duodecim* (Oxford, 1977).
- , *Episulae morales* (*epist.*). L.D. Reynolds, *L. Annaei Senecae ad Lucilium epistulae morales* (2 vols., Oxford, 1965).

- , *Hercules furens* (*Herc. fur.*). O. Zwierlein, *Seneca, Tragoediae* (Oxford, 1986).
- , *De ira* (*ir.*). L.D. Reynolds, *L. Annaei Senecae dialogorum libri duodecim* (Oxford, 1977).
- , *De providentia* (*provid.*). L.D. Reynolds, *L. Annaei Senecae dialogorum libri duodecim* (Oxford, 1977).
- , *De tranquillitate animae* (*tranqu. anim.*). L.D. Reynolds, *L. Annaei Senecae dialogorum libri duodecim* (Oxford, 1977).
- Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epistulae* (*epist.*). W.B. Anderson, *Sidonius: Poems and Letters* (2 vols., London, 1936–1965).
- Silius Italicus (Sil.), *Punica* (*Pun.*). J. Delz, *Silius Italicus, Punica* (Stuttgart, 1987).
- Socrates (Socr.), *Historia ecclesiastica* (*hist. eccl.*). P. Maraval and P. Périchon, *Socrate de Constantinople, Histoire ecclésiastique* (Livres I–VII) (Paris, 2004–2007).
- Sozomen (Soz.), *Historia ecclesiastica* (*hist. eccl.*). J. Bidez and G.C. Hansen, *Sozomenus, Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin, 1960).
- Statius (Stat.), *Silvae* (*silv.*). A. Marastoni, *Statius, Silvae* (Leipzig, 1970).
- , *Thebais* (*Theb.*). A. Klotz and T.C. Kinnert, *Statius, Thebais* (Leipzig, 1973).
- Suetonius (Suet.), *De vita Caesarum*. M. Ihm, *C. Suetonii Tranquilli opera* (Leipzig, 1907).
- Sulpicius Severus (Sulp. Sev.), *Chronicorum libri duo* (*chron.*). CSEL 1:3–105.
- , *Dialogorum libri duo* (*dial.*). CSEL 1:152–216.
- , *Epistulae* (*epist.*). J. Fontaine, *Sulpice Sévère, Vie de saint Martin* (3 vols., Paris, 1967), 1.316–344.
- , *Vita Martini* (*v. Mart.*). J. Fontaine, *Sulpice Sévère, Vie de saint Martin* (3 vols., Paris, 1967), 1.248–316.
- Synesius of Cyrene (Syn. Cyr.), *Epistulae* (*epist.*). R. Hercher, *Epistolographi Graeci* (repr. Amsterdam, 1965), 638–739.
- Tacitus (Tac.), *Annales* (*ann.*). H. Heubner, *P. Cornelius Tacitus, tom. I: Annales* (Stuttgart, 1983).
- , *Germania* (*Germ.*). A. Önnnerfors, *P. Cornelius Tacitus, tom. II, fasc. 2* (Stuttgart, 1983).
- , *Historiae* (*hist.*). H. Heubner, *P. Cornelius Tacitus, tom. II, fasc. 1* (Stuttgart, 1978).
- Terence (Ter.), *Comoediae*. R. Kauer and W.M. Lindsay, *P. Terenti Afri comoediae* (Oxford, 1926).
- Tertullian (Tert.), *Ad nationes* (*nat.*). CCSL 1:11–75.
- , *Adversus Iudaeos* (*adv. Iud.*). CCSL 2:1339–1396.
- , *Adversus Marcionem* (*adv. Marc.*). CCSL 1:441–726.
- , *Adversus Praxean* (*adv. Prax.*). CCSL 2:1159–1205.
- , *De anima* (*an.*). CCSL 2:781–869.
- , *De corona* (*cor.*). CCSL 2:1039–1065.
- , *De cultu feminarum* (*cult. fem.*). CCSL 1:343–370.
- , *De ieiunio* (*ieiun.*). CCSL 2:1257–1277.
- , *De monogamia* (*monog.*). CCSL 2:1229–1253.
- , *De oratione* (*orat.*). CCSL 1:257–274.
- , *De praescriptione haereticorum* (*praescr. haer.*). CCSL 1:187–224.
- , *De pudicitia* (*pud.*). CCSL 2:1281–1330.
- , *De resurrectione carnis* (*resurr. carn.*). CCSL 2:921–1012.

- Themistius (Themist.), *Orationes (orat.)*. G. Downey, A.F. Norman, and H. Schenkl, *Themistii orationes quae supersunt* (3 vols., Leipzig, 1971).
- Theodoret (Theod.), *Commentarius in Psalmos (comm. in Ps.)*. PG 80:857–1997.
- , *Epistulae (epist.)*. Y. Azéma, *Théodoret de Cyr. Correspondance I–III* (Paris, 1955, 1964, 1965).
- , *Historia religiosa (hist. rel.)*. P. Canivet and A. Leroy-Molinghen, *Théodoret de Cyr, L'histoire des moines de Syrie* (2 vols., Paris, 1977, 1979).
- , *De providentia (provid.)*. PG 83: 556–773.
- , *Quaestiones in Octateuchum (quaest. oct.)*. N. Fernández Marcos and A. Sáenz-Badillos, *Theodoreti Cyrensis quaestiones in Octateuchum* (Madrid, 1979).
- Theognis (Theogn.), *Elegiae (eleg.)*. D. Young, *Theognis* (Leipzig, 1971), 1–83.
- Thucydides (Thuc.), *Historiae (hist.)*. H.S. Jones and J.E. Powell, *Thucydidis historiae* (2 vols., repr. Oxford, 1967, 1970).
- Tibullus (Tibull.), *Carmina (carm.)*. G. Luck, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carmina* (Leipzig, 1988), 1–67.
- Valerius Maximus (Val. Max.), *Dicta memorabilia (mem.)*. C. Kempf, *Valerius Maximus. Facta et dicta memorabilia* (Berlin, 1854).
- Varro (Varr.), *De lingua latina (ling. lat.)*. G. Goetz and F. Schoell, *M. Terentii Varronis De lingua latina quae supersunt* (Leipzig, 1910).
- Victor of Vita (Vict. Vit.), *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae (hist. pers.)*. CSEL 7.
- Vincent of Lérins (Vinc. Lér.), *Commonitorium (common.)*. CCSL 64:147–195.
- Virgil (Virg.), *Aeneis (Aen.)*. R.A.B. Mynors, *P. Vergilii Maronis Opera* (Oxford, 1972).
- , *Eclogae (ecl.)*. R. Coleman, *Virgil, Eclogues* (Cambridge, 1977).
- , *Georgica (georg.)*. R.F. Thomas, *Virgil, Georgics* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1988).
- Zeno of Verona (Zen.), *Tractatus (tract.)*. CCSL 22.





## INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

- Aaron, 44, 45, 183–184  
 Abigail, 81  
 Abishag, 6, 21, 33, 37, 39, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82,  
     84, 85, 94, 102, 103, 107–108, 111, 113, 120  
 Abital, 81  
 Abraham, 32, 33, 76, 82, 128, 138  
 Abundantius, 136  
 Acholius, 73  
 Actors, 42, 43, 79, 156, 159  
 Adam, 82  
 Aelius Donatus, 72, 152, 196, 268  
 Aeneas, 125  
 Aeschylus, 99, 131  
 Ahinoam, 81  
 Alcohol, 5, 51, 128, 223, 227–232, 236  
 Alethius of Cahors, 118  
 Allegory, 6, 21, 79, 84–85, 94, 103–104, 107,  
     108, 112, 120, 188, 246  
 Alliteration, 18n84, 64, 67, 84, 85, 102, 117, 135,  
     143, 146, 179, 195, 205, 207, 218, 265, 270,  
     272  
 Almsgiving, 5, 35, 41, 49, 57, 90, 140, 143, 162,  
     204, 207–209, 214, 259, 262, 264–266  
 Altar of Victory, 160  
 Altinum, 2, 3, 7, 13, 14, 69, 70, 112, 123, 135, 138,  
     187, 189, 205  
 Amalek, 104  
 Ambrose, 1, 2, 9n44, 14n62, 16n68, 22n125,  
     66–67, 73, 114, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 128,  
     132, 137, 141, 144, 148, 158, 160, 161, 172, 173,  
     180, 181, 185, 187, 193, 196, 198, 200, 205,  
     207, 209, 216, 217, 219, 245, 250, 258, 261,  
     262, 270, 273  
 Ambrosiaster, 128, 261  
 Amphilochius of Iconium, 196  
 Anadiplosis, 153, 158, 222  
 Anaphora, 84, 122, 135, 142, 154, 184, 208, 219,  
     227, 242, 243, 247, 253, 254, 272  
 Antanacsis, 117, 124  
 Antianos, 86  
 Antichrist, 113  
 Antistrophe, 78, 262  
 Antithesis, 64, 84, 85, 91, 100, 105, 126, 129,  
     130, 131, 132, 134, 135, 141, 143, 145, 154, 158,  
     159, 169, 176, 178, 189, 206, 210, 211, 213, 221,  
     226, 227, 241, 242, 244, 248, 257  
 Antony the Great, 63, 86  
 Apollo, 99  
 Apollonius of Tyana, 86  
 Apphy of Oxyrhynchus, 133  
 Aristotle, 95–96  
 Asella, 92, 117, 205, 239, 242  
 Asyndeton, 70, 74, 84, 87, 95, 111, 122, 135, 142,  
     154, 193, 208, 227, 234, 235, 247, 262  
 Atellan farce, 79–81  
 Athanasius, 6n33, 65, 86, 88, 89, 117, 153, 154,  
     212  
 Athenaeus, 165  
 Atomism, 98  
 Augustine, 1, 3n19, 8n41, 18n76, 61, 62, 70,  
     75, 83, 85, 86, 87, 89, 94, 95, 105, 107, 109,  
     114, 115, 117, 118, 121, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128,  
     130, 132, 133, 134, 136, 143, 145, 150, 160, 161,  
     170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180,  
     184, 185, 186, 190, 191, 193, 200, 204, 205,  
     208, 214, 217, 218, 230, 234, 237, 239, 244,  
     246, 247, 252, 253, 256, 257, 259, 261, 262,  
     271  
 Ausonius, 252  
 Avarice, 42, 43, 44, 45, 122, 124, 130, 131, 160,  
     163, 169, 177, 204, 207, 208, 209, 219, 264,  
     265  
 Baptism, 185  
 Basil, 86, 99, 116, 124, 132, 136, 137, 141, 148,  
     169, 172, 174, 175, 183, 201, 204, 205, 206,  
     207, 208, 216, 232, 239, 246, 253, 266  
 Bathsheba, 81  
 Bede, 11n55, 133, 218  
 Bessarion, 89  
 Bethlehem, 2, 14, 15, 19n93, 57, 61, 88, 129, 144,  
     179, 180, 186, 193, 213, 214, 215, 234, 267,  
     269  
 Blesilla, 205  
 Caesarius of Arles, 18, 169, 204  
 Caligula, 183  
*Captatio*, 156–171, 208  
 Cato, 20, 21, 36, 37, 84, 101, 137, 182  
 Cauterization, 160–161  
 Celibacy, 136, 140, 146, 261, 268  
 Chaerea, 144, 145, 147

- Charioteers, 42, 43, 52, 53, 156, 159, 240, 245–247  
 Chiasmus, 18n79, 87, 100, 141, 153, 154, 164, 173, 194, 213, 221, 241, 242  
 Cicero, 1, 20, 21, 61, 70, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 86, 87, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 101, 102, 109, 111, 115, 141, 143, 156, 164, 167, 168, 169, 173, 182, 195, 200, 201, 206, 251, 252, 260  
 Cleanthes, 34, 35, 97, 98  
 Clytemnestra, 99  
 Comedy, 20n98, 42, 43, 79, 81, 149, 151–152, 165, 225, 257  
 Constantine, 158, 213, 218–219  
 Constantinople, 164, 192, 197, 199, 200, 257, 262  
 Consuls, 50, 51, 183, 224  
 Council of Agde, 141  
 Council of Aquileia, 69–70  
 Council of Carthage, 140, 141  
 Council of Constantinople, 197  
 Council of Elvira, 141  
 Council of Neocaesarea, 3n18  
 Council of Seville, 187  
 Council of Toledo, 136, 141  
 Council of Vaison, 17, 262  
 Cuthbert, 133  
 Cyprian, 9n44, 21, 38, 39, 63, 108, 113–114, 128, 136, 140, 142, 143, 150, 161, 169, 172, 175, 176, 177, 180, 184, 205, 208, 218, 223, 244  
 Cyril of Alexandria, 3n21, 169  
 Cyril of Jerusalem, 186, 217  
  
 Dalmatius, 62  
 Damasus, Pope, 9, 69, 157, 179, 196, 261  
 David, 6, 32, 33, 40, 41, 48, 49, 76–79, 81, 82, 84, 85, 99, 102–103, 137–138, 221  
 Declamation, 109–110, 114, 199  
 Demetrius of Phaleron, 110  
 Demipho, 102  
 Democritus, 34, 35, 97, 98  
 Demosthenes, 46, 47, 201  
 Didymus of Alexandria, 85, 113, 196, 198  
 Dio Chrysostom, 271  
 Diogenes of Babylon, 97  
*Disiunctio*, 95, 185, 205, 219, 226, 227, 247, 257, 272  
 Domitius Afer, 21, 45, 182–183, 250  
 Domnio, 15n65  
 Donatists, 147, 180  
  
 Ecclesiastical officers  
     Acolytes, 10n50, 40, 41, 142–143  
     Bishops, 3n21, 10, 153, 181, 184, 186, 187, 214  
     Cantors, 10n50, 40, 41, 143  
     Deacons, 10, 79, 142, 152, 184, 208  
     Lectors, 8, 10n50, 40, 41, 128, 142, 143, 181  
     Priests, 3, 7n37, 10, 17, 43, 49, 55, 129, 142, 153, 163, 181, 184, 185, 189, 208, 216, 261  
     Subdeacons, 142  
 Education, 3, 20, 35, 49, 60, 72, 75, 94, 109, 116, 145, 152, 192, 201, 210, 232  
 Eglah, 81  
 Eleusius of Cyzicus, 62  
 Empedocles, 75  
 Enoch, 170  
 Enosh, 82  
 Envy, 44, 45, 169–170, 187  
 Epicureans, 269  
 Epicurus, 16, 46, 47, 98  
 Epidiorthosis, 65, 172  
 Epiphanius of Salamis, 11n54, 142, 186  
 Epizeuxis, 227  
 Erasmus, 70, 74  
 Esau, 82  
 Eucharist, 143, 180, 187, 189, 194  
 Eunomians, 249  
 Euripides, 46, 47, 131  
 Eustochium, 14, 57, 88, 134, 190, 229, 245, 246, 255, 259, 267–268  
 Evagrius of Antioch, 6n33, 7, 66, 151, 196  
 Evagrius of Pontus, 137, 255  
 Evocius of Uzala, 62  
*Exempla*  
     biblical, 65, 76, 137  
     classical, 65, 76, 147  
 Exsuperius of Toulouse, 127, 264–265  
  
 Fasting, 5, 35, 45, 49, 51, 53, 62, 68, 88, 232, 234, 235, 246  
 Felix (St.), 128, 205, 217  
 Fish, 165, 166, 208  
 Flavian of Antioch, 186  
 Flavius Dexter, 196  
 Fronto, 1, 151  
 Furia, 60–61  
  
 Garrulousness, 40, 41, 132, 133, 192, 210  
 Gaudentius, 146  
*Genitivus inversus*, 92, 218  
 Gifts, 5, 55, 123, 149, 150, 158, 206, 207, 259, 260, 265, 268  
 Gluttony, 5  
 Gold, 8, 38, 39, 40, 41, 48, 49, 50, 51, 122, 131, 167, 212–217, 219, 222, 234, 265

- Gorgias of Leontini, 86, 96  
Gorgonia, 201  
Gossip, 134, 148, 223, 240, 249, 254, 255, 258  
Gourmandry, 128, 156, 163–166, 257  
Gratian, 157, 159  
Gregory of Nazianzus, 2, 6n33, 9n44, 21, 47, 61, 64, 73, 86, 88, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 117, 124, 126, 132, 133, 137, 149, 153, 160, 162, 164, 169, 171, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 181, 189, 190, 192, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 205, 210, 212, 215, 226, 231, 232, 239, 243, 249, 252, 256, 258, 264, 272  
Gregory of Nyssa, 65, 86, 105, 123, 124, 143, 154, 160, 163, 175, 176, 196, 216, 219, 227, 246, 262  
Gregory the Great, 18, 126, 175, 181, 241, 242, 243, 257  
  
Hagar, 82  
Haggith, 81  
*Hebraica veritas*, 6  
Heliodorus, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 33, 39, 60, 62, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 108, 116, 117–119, 132, 135, 179, 187, 189, 209  
Helvidius, 112  
Hesiod, 36, 37, 97, 99  
Himerius of Tarragona, 9–10  
Hippocratic oath, 54, 55, 255–256  
Homer, 36, 37, 97, 98, 99, 102  
Homoioptoton, 87  
Homoiooteleuton, 78, 84, 95, 135, 143, 161, 205, 242, 247  
Hospitality, 35, 88–89, 127, 128  
Humility, 148, 269  
Hyperbaton, 71, 85, 111, 146, 153, 196, 234, 236, 242  
Hypocrisy, 9, 145, 153, 159, 166, 172, 174–176, 192, 206, 234, 243–244, 268, 272  
  
Ignatius of Antioch, 130, 148, 177  
Innocentius, 62  
Isaac, 32, 33, 76, 82  
Isidore of Seville, 121, 126  
Isocolon, 178, 227  
Isocrates, 4n27, 34, 35, 97, 110  
*Ius osculi*, 227  
  
Jacob, 82  
Jared, 82  
Jerusalem, 7, 69, 180, 186, 213, 214  
John Cassian, 73, 136, 169, 205, 206, 207, 234, 266  
John Chrysostom, 2, 3n20, 8n41, 21, 81, 86, 88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 105, 126, 128, 130, 132, 134, 136, 137, 140, 143, 148, 149, 152, 160, 161, 162, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 182, 184, 186, 187, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 198, 204, 207, 213, 214, 216, 219, 221, 223, 224, 225, 229, 231, 232, 235, 239, 244, 246, 253, 254, 256, 257, 264, 271  
John of Jerusalem, 179, 186, 215  
John the Baptist, 81  
John the Dwarf, 255  
Jovinian, 15–16, 83, 144, 205, 220, 269  
Julian Pomerius, 18, 89, 122, 123, 124, 128, 137, 141, 148, 149, 161, 162, 163, 169, 173, 174, 175, 176, 181, 183, 190, 193, 201, 207, 208, 212, 216, 229, 231, 234, 236, 237, 242, 255, 257, 259, 262, 272  
Juno, 125  
Justinian, 80  
Juvenal, 21, 133, 140, 237  
  
Kenan, 82  
Keturah, 82  
Kuklos, 160  
  
Lactantius, 21, 125, 178  
Laeta, 148  
Lea, 205  
Legacy-hunting, 5, 156–171, 208, 242  
Leucippus, 98  
Lictors, 50, 51, 224  
Luscius Lanuvinus, 270–271  
Lysimachus, 102  
  
Maachah, 81  
Marathonius of Nicomedia, 62  
Marcella, 15, 141, 163, 198, 210, 234, 259, 267  
Marcian, 62  
Marcus Pontidius, 195  
Martial, 21, 133, 167, 168, 248  
Martin of Tours, 62  
Martyrs, 69, 212, 248, 257  
Mary, 38, 39, 112  
Maximus of Jerusalem, 186  
Melania the Younger, 217, 262, 265, 268  
Menander, 46, 47, 131  
Merchants, 170–171, 265  
Metaphor, 18n80, 64, 73, 94, 110, 115, 117, 123, 126, 139, 145, 160, 161, 191, 192, 208, 210, 212, 213, 246, 247, 249, 252, 256  
Methusaleh, 82

- Michal, 81  
*Militia Christi*, 61–62, 125–126, 241–242  
 Mime, 79–80, 152  
 Mnesarchus of Samos, 97  
 Monasticism  
     Egyptian, 7n36, 90, 136, 212, 265  
     Syrian, 7, 60, 65–66, 72, 86, 90, 136, 265  
 Moses, 12, 13, 35, 76, 83, 86, 115, 183  
  
 Naeratius Cerealis, 198  
 Naphtali, 107  
 Nestor, 36, 37, 102  
 Novius, 80  
  
 Olympiodorus, 112  
 Onasus of Segesta, 130  
 Origen, 21, 84, 103–104, 106, 107, 112, 123, 179,  
     180, 181, 216, 217, 245, 247, 270  
 Oysters, 42, 43, 165–166  
  
 Pachomius, 89  
 Palladius, 62, 65, 73, 90, 132, 135, 168, 175, 207,  
     217, 229, 235, 236, 264  
 Pammachius, 245, 246, 262, 269  
 Pamphila, 144, 145, 147  
 Paraenesis, 4–5, 61, 120, 243  
 Parechesis, 92, 205, 218, 236, 244, 264  
 Parison, 84, 95, 135, 178, 262  
 Paronomasia, 64, 84, 87, 202, 218, 261, 265  
 Patrick, 17, 67, 188, 210, 272  
 Paul (St.), 44, 45, 48, 49, 111, 112, 123, 131, 135,  
     173, 184, 188, 191, 209, 210, 221, 230, 241,  
     242, 249, 250, 260, 267, 272  
 Paul of Cataquas, 127  
 Paula, 2, 14n61, 61, 79, 88, 92, 139, 144, 148,  
     149, 167, 194, 195, 234, 239, 241, 245, 246,  
     263, 265, 267–268, 272  
 Paulina, 245, 246  
 Paulinian, 67  
 Paulinus of Antioch, 7n37, 119  
 Paulinus of Milan, 62, 126  
 Paulinus of Nola, 1, 61, 62, 64, 77, 92, 125, 126,  
     128, 143, 176, 201, 205, 207, 217, 218, 223,  
     230, 238, 247  
 Perez, 36, 37, 106  
 Peter (St.), 44, 45, 48, 49, 112, 184, 212, 213  
 Peter Abelard, 19  
 Peter Chrysologus, 170  
 Peter Damian, 18, 104  
 Pharisees, 52, 53, 240, 243, 244, 272  
 Pinianus, 262, 265  
 Plato, 34, 35, 87, 96–97, 98, 99, 100, 245, 246  
  
 Plautus, 21, 62, 81, 102, 149, 150–151, 152, 156,  
     206, 271  
 Pleonasm, 70, 101, 111, 146, 150, 194, 195, 201,  
     206, 219, 235, 237, 264  
 Pliny the Elder, 236  
 Pliny the Younger, 1, 264  
 Polyptoton, 117, 144, 145, 146, 153, 160, 184,  
     205, 209  
 Polysyndeton, 157  
 Pomponius, 80  
 Pontius, 205, 225  
 Possidius, 95, 123, 128, 134, 136, 174, 185, 186,  
     205, 217, 253, 257, 261  
*Praeritio*, 82, 97  
 Prayer, 35, 53, 68, 86, 89–90, 91, 92, 132, 133,  
     140, 243, 253  
 Preaching, 16, 44, 45, 46, 47, 174, 185–201, 213,  
     271  
 Pride, 46, 47, 137, 196, 209, 223  
 Proculus of Marseille, 118  
 Prostitutes, 36, 37, 106, 156, 159–160  
 Pseudo-Athanasius, 205  
 Pseudo-Basil, 144  
 Pseudo-Cyprian, 136, 141, 148, 174, 223  
 Pseudo-Libanius, 4  
 Pseudo-Paulinus of Nola, 130  
 Pythagoras, 34, 35, 97, 165  
  
 Quintilian, 65, 101, 109, 110, 182, 244  
 Quintus Gallius, 46, 47, 202  
 Quodvultdeus, 103  
  
 Rahab, 36, 37, 106  
 Rebecca, 32, 33, 82  
 Rusticus of Narbonne, 12–14, 115, 170, 172,  
     234, 249  
  
 Sabinian, 79, 150, 152, 205  
 Sallust, 21, 101  
 Salvina, 204  
 Seneca the Younger, 1  
 Seth, 82  
 Siderius of Palaebisca, 62  
 Sidonius, 1, 230  
 Silence, 8, 40, 41, 44, 45, 132  
 Simonides, 36, 37, 97, 99  
 Siricius, Pope, 9–11, 15, 116, 126, 142, 261  
 Slander, 19n93, 52, 53, 55, 148–149, 249–252  
 Socrates, 46, 47, 99–100  
 Solitude, 7, 66, 132–133  
 Solomon, 34, 35, 40, 41, 54, 55, 81, 85, 137, 212,  
     216, 222

- Sophocles, 36, 37, 100  
 Stesichorus, 36, 37, 97, 99  
 Stock characters, 81  
 Stoicism, 67, 93–94, 97, 98, 242, 245, 248  
*Subintroductio*, 14n59, 136  
 Sulla, 80  
 Swan-song, 99–100  
 Symeon the Stylite, 89  
 Symmachus, 1, 262  
 Syncletica, 88, 171, 271  
  
 Temple (Jewish), 11, 44, 45, 49, 212, 216–218, 222  
 Terence, 21, 144–147, 152, 267, 268, 270, 271  
 Terentia, 151  
 Tertullian, 21, 64, 76, 77, 138, 166, 168, 239  
 Theodoret, 86, 88, 128, 154  
 Theophilus of Alexandria, 3n21, 178, 179, 214  
 Theophrastus, 95–96  
 Tithing, 38, 39, 123  
 Trimalchio, 163  
 Typology, 103–104, 111–112, 183, 218, 243  
  
 Valentinian I, 67, 156–158, 160, 161  
 Valentinian II, 160  
*Variatio*, 5, 110, 120, 146, 185, 227  
 Varro, 104, 206  
 Vestal Virgins, 159  
 Victricius of Rouen, 62  
 Virgil, 21, 60, 74, 75, 76, 101, 125, 165, 209, 244  
  
 Widows, 3, 40, 41, 54, 55, 69, 110, 134, 135, 136, 139–140, 141, 148, 149, 156, 157, 158, 161, 207, 253, 259, 261  
 Wisdom, 6, 35, 37, 39, 53, 73, 84–87, 91–92, 101, 103–108, 111, 113, 115, 118, 137, 191, 196  
  
 Xenocrates, 34, 35, 97, 98  
  
 Zebinas, 86  
 Zeno, 34, 35, 97, 98  
 Zerah, 106  
 Zipporah, 83

# INDEX OF SOURCES

## BIBLICAL TEXTS

Gen.		Jos.	
1:28	221	2:18, 21	106
3:24	138	19:18	78
5:3-27	83	19:35	107
5:5	82		
5:8	82	Jdg.	
5:11	82	13:4, 7, 14	228
5:14	82		
5:20	82	1 Sam.	
5:27	82, 170	1:15	228
16:3	82	12:3	260
16:15-16	82	18:20-27	81
25:1-2	82	25:42	81
25:20	82	28:4	78
25:26	82	30:5	104
35:27	82		
35:28	82	2 Sam.	
38:27-29	106	3:4	81
43:22	206	5:4	77
		11:27	81
Ex.		15:16	81
2:16-22	83	20:3	81
18:1-6	83		
28:17	245	1 Kgs.	
		1:1b	80
Lev.		1:2	111
10:9	227, 228	1:2b	111
21:13	220	1:4	111
21:17-21	220	1:1-4	77, 78
23:40-43	221	1:3, 15	78
		1:4	85
Num.		1:11	81
6:3	228	2:17, 21-22	78
12:1	83	7:48	216
18:20	121	7:50	216
Dt.		2 Kgs.	
10:9	121	4:8	78
12:12	121	4:12, 25, 36	78
14:26	228		
16:1-6	221	1 Chron.	
18:1	123	2:55	107
29:5	228	3:2	81
32:9	123	28:15	216
34:7	83, 86		

2 Chron.		Zech.	
4:19	216	11:18-20	245
4:21	216	11:15	113
4:22	216		
Ezr.		Mal.	
1:9	216	1:6b-c	178
Neh.		Jdt.	
8:13-18	221	11:19	113
Ps.		Sir.	
1:2b	94	3:13a	188
49:20	250	6:18-19	93
49:20-21	250	40:20	228
72:26b	121	45:27	121
117:8-9	226		
118.18	221	Wis.	
Prov.		4:8-9	73
1:14	206	6:13a	92
4:5-9	85, 102	7:9	219
4:8c	111	1 Macc.	
10:1a	188	1:23	216
17:6b	188		
20:1	228	Mt.	
24:21-22	251	5:27-30	255
31:4, 6	228	7:3-5	272
		11:19a	230
Is.		12:1-8	221
5:11, 22	228	13:45-46	170
24:9	228	19:19	256
28:7	228	23:5b	244
29:9	228	24:12	112, 113
56:12	228	25:35	127
		25:36	253
Jer.		26:27	230
12:13b	127		
Lam.		Mk.	
3:24a	121	6:2-4	90
		11:25	89
Ezek.			
1:5	245	Lk.	
		1:15	228
Joel		4:16-17	142
2:15	221	4:31	198
		6:1	198
Micah		6:6	198
2:11	228	6:38	260
		6:41-42	272
		11:9-13	260
		11:41	90
		12:49	107



Lk. ( <i>cont.</i> )		Col.	
16:1-3	219	1:7	215
16:9	220	4:6a	191
16:11	220		
24:32	107	1 Thess.	
		2:11	178
Jn.			
13:34	260	1 Tim.	
		1:2	178
Acts		3:2	162
1:17, 26	121	3:3	227
3:2-3	90	3:8	126
3:6a	219	4:6	215
11:26	257	4:13	142
13:15	142	5:2	135
20:28	162	5:9	139
20:35	260	5:23	230
20:36	90	6:8	124
Rom.		2 Tim.	
7:14a	221	2:1	178
12:11	112	2:4	126
15:16	215	2:24	132
		3:14	173, 174
1 Cor.		4:3	249
2:13c	221		
4:1	215	Tit.	
4:15	178	1:4	178
9:13	227	1:7	126, 162, 227
9:13-14	123	1:9	173, 174
10:11	218	1:11	126
12:12-27	210		
14:30-33a	188	Phlm.	
15:33	131	10	178
2 Cor.			
3:6b	79	Jas.	
6:13	178	4:11a	250
7:2	272	5:14	253
8:13-14	112		
11:23	215	1 Pet.	
		2:25	162
Gal.		3:15b	174
		5:2	126
2:9	212	5:2-4	185
		5:13	178
Eph.			
4:13	116	3 Jn.	
		4	178
Phil.			
1:1	162	Rev.	
2:22	178	1:3	142

GREEK AND ROMAN TEXTS

Aeschylus		1.85	141
<i>Agam.</i> 1444-1445	99	1.86	128, 134, 258
Ambrose		1.87	141
<i>epist.</i>		1.88	172
1.6.2	174	1.89	132
4.15.6	143, 144	1.96	137
4.17.13-14	121	1.100	172
7.5.2.5	73	1.101	193
7.36.5	200	1.104	152
73 [18].13-14	160	1.114	137
<i>epist. ex coll.</i>		1.145	209
14.26	91	1.148	89
14.29	85	1.152	123
14.43	250	1.175	126
14.105	128	1.184	126
<i>exp. Ps. 1</i>		1.185	128
53.2	251	1.212	141
47 1.3-4	198	1.236-238	137
<i>in</i> 8 2.1	68	1.246	126
8.54	168	1.248	261
9.21	168	2.32-36	137
18.31	92	2.66	131
19.19	77	2.67	126, 128
19.44	196	2.69	209
<i>fug. saec.</i> 2.7	122	2.70-71	89
<i>Hel. et ieiun.</i>	5.14 92	2.86-90	174
<i>hex.</i>		2.103	128
1.18.31	64	2.107	128
5.7.19	64	2.109	128
6.6.33	270	2.121	178
<i>Ios.</i> 2.5	162	2.122	187
<i>myst.</i> 9.54	177	2.123	178, 209
<i>Nab.</i> 2.4	160	2.126-127	128
<i>off.</i>		2.133	126
1.2	178	2.134	178, 182
1.3-4	173	2.135	160
1.8	132	2.137	219
1.18	132, 148	2.137-143	217
1.21	137	2.144	207, 262
1.22	273	3.1	137
1.24	178	3.9	126
1.25-29	126	3.58	169
1.28	126	<i>parad.</i> 6.34	92
1.29	114	<i>vid.</i> 2.9	77, 87
1.31	132	<i>virg.</i> 1.6.30; 2.4.29	255
1.35	132	<i>virginit.</i> 12.71	143
1.39	128		
1.68	132		
1.83	205		

Ambrosiaster		<i>hist. mon.</i>	
<i>comm. in 2 Tim.</i> 2.4	128	1.4	135
<i>quaest.</i> 52	218	1.6	135
		1.17	88
Ammianus Marcellinus		1.22	137
14.6.22	167	1.62	89
26.8.2	228	6.1	132
28.4.22	167	8.2	65
		8.16	175
Anaximenes		8.55–56	89
<i>rhet.</i> 32.3	110	8.60	175
		12.1	65
Anonymous		13.4	89
1 <i>Clem.</i> 5.1	212	13.7	89
2 <i>Clem.</i> 19.1	142	14.18	170
<i>anth. Gr.</i>		14.19–22	265
10.76.3–4	160	18.1	90
10.111	169, 252	20.7	89, 132
<i>apoph. patr.</i>		23.2	62
Agathon 27	90	24.1	65
Aio 1	86	v. <i>Alex. Acem.</i> 27	90
Andrew 1	132	v. <i>Dan. Styl.</i> 4	88
Arsenius 2	132	v. <i>Desid. Cad.</i> 21	175
Hierax	250	v. <i>Hil. Arel.</i> 2	247
Iohannes 15	250	v. <i>Is.</i> 4.17	62
Isidorus		v. <i>Olymp.</i> 5	262
1	175	v. <i>Pach. SBo</i> 19	89, 90
6	160	v. <i>Theod. Syk.</i> 25	162
Moyses			
17	175	Apuleius	
18	250	<i>apol.</i> 37	100
Or 15	250	<i>met.</i>	
Poemen		2.2	230
19	229	5.13	151
25	177	6.20	164
Syncretica			
10	171	Aristophanes	
13	271	<i>nub.</i>	
15	88	129	95, 101
Theodorus		854	95
5	132		
17	136	Aristotle	
Xious 1	229	<i>rhet.</i> 2.14.4	95
<i>const. apost.</i> 2.57	186		
<i>cons. Zacc. et Apoll.</i> 1.18.5	77	Arrian	
	177	<i>Epict.</i> 4.1.148	167, 168
<i>Didache</i> 3.5			
<i>hist. Aug.</i>		Asterius of Amasia	
12.7.1	99	<i>ad Ren.</i>	
19.14.2	99	7.17	124
20.15.2; 21.2.1	99	8.18	62

Athanasius		<i>112</i> 2	87
<i>v. Ant.</i>		<i>127</i> 9	190
<i>prol.</i> 3	117	<i>epist.</i>	
1.2-3	65	20 *.4-7	130
4.1	88	29.7	185, 190
17.7	89	34.5	118
67.1	89	41.1	186
84.3-7	89	57.1	70
93.2	86	65.11	136
		85.2	127, 176
Athenaeus		96.2	127
<i>deipn.</i>		151.2	89
10.419	165	151.8	126
10.440-441	227	153	89
		166.1	114
Augustine		189.5	62
<i>adnot. in Iob</i> 34	87	191.1	143
<i>bapt.</i> 2.2.3	118	203.1	170
<i>bon. coniug.</i> 23.30	133	209.9	130
<i>c. Don.</i> 11.15	200	211.10	143
<i>c. Iul.</i> 6 p. 842	83	211.11	150
<i>c. litt. Pet.</i> 2.21.48	109	211.13	204
<i>civ. dei</i>		211.15	178
1.18	86	262.9	143
2.7	145	263.1	259
16.25	217	<i>mor. eccl. cath.</i>	
16.38	217	1.1	173
20.3	85	1.35	244
<i>conf.</i>		<i>op. mon.</i> 28.36	244
8.6	126	<i>praec.</i> 4.1	205
9.8	62	<i>quaest. in hept.</i> 4.33	105
10.7-9	67	<i>serm.</i>	
<i>cons. evang.</i>		15	214
2.30.77	94	19.4	190
4.3.4	94	38	171
<i>div. quaest. oct. trib.</i>		52.20	200
58	115	96.4	190
73	230	101.9	200
<i>doctr. chr.</i>		107.10	160
2.9	61	151.8	190
4.5	172, 191,	161.10	259
	200	163B.5	190, 200
4.24	190	164.3	200
4.27	174	177.6	160
4.29	117	223A	246
<i>enarr. in Ps.</i>		335A.2	200
30 2.2.3	175	356.13	127, 259
33 2.15	247	<i>serm. dom.</i> 2.41	176
67 19	121	<i>tract. in Ioh.</i> 3.21	190
74 1	223	<i>util. cred.</i> 18.36	252
86 6	107		
91 11	87		

Aulus Gellius		41.1	160
<i>noct. Att.</i>		75.2	175
1.22.10	104	85.5	169
6.3.14	137	90.5	169
10.3.16	101	155.3	133
10.23	227	156.4	133
		193.1	169
Aurelius Victor		200.5	169
<i>hist. abbrev.</i>		225.2	169
41.11	99	<i>stat. virg.</i>	
		22	205
Ausonius		44	204
<i>epigr.</i> 76	252		
Basil		Cassiodorus	
<i>epist.</i>		<i>inst. div.</i>	
2.2	132	praef. 4	201
2.3	137		
2.6	204	Catullus	
22.2	205	<i>carm.</i>	
24	148	2.5	151
42.1	137	8.1	151
42.2	116, 132	14.24–25	151
42.3	132, 172, 207		
42.4	175	Celsus	
44.1	174, 206	<i>medic.</i>	
46.2	86	1.3.32	87
54	216	2.1	77
55	136	2.18	164, 165
173	141		
<i>hom. de inv.</i> 1	169	Cicero	
<i>reg. brev. tract.</i> p. 1304	132	<i>acad. pr.</i>	
<i>reg. fus. tract.</i>		1.3	172
7	253	2.5	101
22	205	<i>amic.</i>	
42	90	5	101
<i>spir. sanc.</i> 1.1	208	76	141
		90	182
Besa		99–100	81
<i>v. Shen.</i> 81–82	89	<i>Arch.</i> 3	203
		<i>Brut.</i>	
Boethius		82	110
<i>cons. phil.</i> 3.3	160	100	203
		213	94
Caesar		246	195, 201
<i>bell. civ.</i>		<i>Cael.</i> 9	94
1.2.6	200	<i>de orat.</i>	
3.112.9	200	1.20	109
		1.23	115
Caesarius of Arles		1.171	101
<i>serm.</i>		1.202	192
16.2	169	1.231	114
		2.251–252	79

2.260	101	20	91
3.91	108	21	95
3.96	110	22	100
3.225	203	23	97
<i>divin.</i>		26	101
1.59	111	28–29	115
2.25	80	31	102
2.51	182	34–35	86
<i>epist. ad Att.</i>		38	101
13.23.3	252	47	77
16.7.4	206	63	99
<i>epist. ad Brut.</i> 1.3.2	111	<i>Sest.</i>	
<i>epist. ad fam.</i>		18	143
4.1.2	252	31	108
9.20.2	101	<i>Tusc. disp.</i>	
13.29.2	108	1.19	75
14.2.2	151	1.94	87
<i>fin.</i> 5.4.11	61	2.11–12	177
<i>harusp.</i> 43	244	3.69	96
<i>Manl.</i> 37	273	5.97	164
<i>Mur.</i>		<i>Verr.</i>	
16	203	2.1.45	92
42	200	2.1.76	99
<i>nat. deo.</i> 2.148	173	2.1.92	203
<i>off.</i>		2.3.4	177, 251
1.151	94	2.3.207	70
2.83	260		
3.5	61	Clement of Alexandria	
3.74	169	<i>paed.</i>	
<i>orat.</i>		3.11	143
19	110	3.3.18.3	73, 87
27	110	3.11.53.3–4	204
47	191	3.11.75.1	134
53	195	3.35.2	143
<i>Phil.</i>		<i>quis div. salv.</i> 42.2	64
1.36	111	<i>strom.</i>	
3.3	67	1.3.23.3	249
10.8	111	1.27.1–2	161
<i>Pis.</i>		7.1.3.2	256
33	206		
97	206	<i>Codex Theodosianus</i>	
<i>Planc.</i> 62	201	16.2.4	158
<i>Quinc.</i>		16.2.20	157
39	252		
79	156	Columella	
<i>rep.</i> 1.51	206	<i>de re rust.</i> 9.4	165
<i>Scaur.</i> 23	203		
<i>senect.</i>		Curtius Rufus	
3	101	<i>hist. Alex.</i> 8.6.18	225
9	93		
10	99	Cyprian	
13	96, 97	<i>bon. pat.</i> 3	175

<i>Don.</i> 11	244	7.28	98
<i>epist.</i>		7.44	97
1.1.2	128	7.176	98
4.2	136	9.43	98
4.3	150	10.13	98
7.2	128		
38.2	142	Dionysius of Halicarnassus	
43.6	162	<i>Isoc.</i> 1	97
45.4.3	143		
59.1.1	143	Egeria	
59.5.2	208	<i>itin.</i> 25.1	186, 215
60.3.2	218		
77.3.2	143	Eucherius	
<i>hab. virg.</i>		<i>inst. ad Sal.</i> 2	85
5	176		
9	143	Eugippius	
18	223	<i>comment. v. Sev.</i> 43.6	174
21	223		
<i>zel. et liv.</i>		Euripides	
6–11	169	<i>Phoen.</i> 528–531	91
7	177		
		Eusebius	
Cyril of Alexandria		<i>dem. evang.</i>	
<i>comm. in Is.</i> p. 1305	169	4.16.60	85
<i>exp. in Ps.</i> p. 756	169	5.1.5	85
		<i>hist. eccl.</i> 8.14.17	176
Cyril of Jerusalem		<i>praec. evang.</i> 11.4.6	85
<i>cat.</i> 10.14	186		
<i>hom. in paralyt.</i> 20	186	Evagrius Ponticus	
		<i>oct. spir. mal.</i> p. 1164	137
Cyril of Scythopolis		<i>sent. virg.</i> 55	255
<i>v. Euth.</i> (ed. Schwartz)			
p. 13	65	Florus	
p. 14	90	<i>epit. Tit. Liv.</i> 1.8.4	85
<i>v. Sab.</i> (ed. Schwartz) p. 88			
	65	Fronto	
		<i>epist.</i> 4.7.2	151
Didymus			
<i>comm. in Zach.</i>		Fulgentius	
4.162	113	<i>mit.</i> 3.4	77
4.241	85		
Dio Chrysostom		Gerontios	
<i>orat.</i> 17.7	160	<i>v. Mel. prol.</i>	88
		5	132
		38	265
Diodore of Sicily			
5.26.2–3	229	Gregory of Elvira	
		<i>comm. in Cant.</i> 2.35	247
Diogenes Laertius		<i>tract. sanc. script.</i> 12 ll.	260–268
<i>v. phil.</i> 3.2	97		107
4.14	98		
5.40–41	96		

Gregory of Nazianzus		36.4	169
<i>epist.</i>		42.20	95
4.13	198	42.24	192
5.1	198	43.10	201
6.1	198	43.12	94
51.5	198	43.21	176
<i>orat.</i>		43.23	73
2.1	149	43.26	215
2.8	126	43.47	252
2.12	93	43.60	124, 176, 205
2.14	137	43.61	88
2.18	160	44.9	88
2.34	64		
2.47	173	Gregory of Nyssa	
2.69	175	<i>epist.</i>	
2.71	174	17.2	86
2.72	91	17.8–10	216
2.100	171	v. <i>Greg. Thaum.</i> (ed. Heil)	
7.2	86	p. 6	124
7.4	201	p. 8	65
7.10	176, 256	p. 14	175
7.18	73	p. 25	124
7.20	160	pp. 36–37	216
8.5	201	v. <i>Macr.</i>	
8.13	88	5	262
14.6	177	11	124
14.11	162	29	124, 143
15.12	92	v. <i>Moys.</i>	
17.12	226	2.196	105
18.1	212	2.286	163, 227
18.8	124	<i>virg.</i>	
18.20	264	23.1	175, 176
18.23	205	23.2	65
20.1	196		
21.6	212	Gregory of Tours	
21.9	126, 153, 173, 178, 181	<i>glor. mart.</i> 57	62
21.37	117		
24.3	199	Gregory the Great	
24.13	88	<i>hom. in evang.</i> 2.38.16	143
26.14	73	<i>mor. in Iob</i> 8.44	190
24.17	226	<i>reg. past.</i>	
27.1	249	1 praef.	175
32.2	190	1.1	181, 256
32.4	61	1.2	175
32.10–12	210	1.8	126
32.13	171	2.2	175
32.14	132, 272	2.3	175, 181
32.32	133	2.4	132
33.7	164	2.5	254, 257
33.8	258	2.6	181
36.1	199	3.40	175
36.3	132	4	137



Heliodorus		8.1	154
<i>Aethiopica</i> 1.3.3	177	13.2	177
Hilary of Poitiers		Isidore of Pelusium	
<i>tract. in Ps. n8</i> 2.19	77	<i>epist.</i> 1.29	208
Homer		Isidore of Seville	
<i>Il.</i> 1.249	102	<i>eccl. off.</i>	
3.108–110	91	2.1.1	121
13.729	209	2.2.1	126
Horace		2.2.3	141
<i>carm.</i>		<i>etym.</i>	
2.11.6–7	77	7.12.29	143
2.6.15	165	18.46.1	152
3.2.20	244	20.2.15	164
3.16.33	165	Jerome	
4.13.5	88	<i>adv. Iov.</i>	
<i>epist.</i> 1.1.77–79	167	1.1	91, 269
1.1.78	208	1.3	221
1.7.49	99	1.4	138
2.2.216	68	1.5	83
<i>epod.</i> 8.3–4	74	1.10	99
<i>sat.</i>		1.13	61, 196, 267
1.4.39	71	1.14	139
1.7.3	134	1.16	138, 221
1.10.37	71	1.24	103
2.2.17–18	165	1.24, 26	78, 221
2.2.70–88	165	1.28	133
2.2.77	231	1.34	229, 247, 273
2.4.31–34, 45–46	163	1.36	254
2.4.33	166	1.40	164
2.4.35–36	166	1.48	101
2.5.25, 44	208	2.8	152
2.5.56	169	2.10	246
2.5.93–95	169	2.11	87
2.5.106–109	169	2.14	98
Ignatius of Antioch		2.21	144, 205, 269
<i>epist. ad Eph.</i> 4.1	177	2.34	122, 220
5.3	177	2.35	106
6.1	177	2.36	144, 269
7.1	130–131	2.38	269
<i>epist. ad Magn.</i>		<i>apol. c. Ruf.</i>	
3.1	177	1.15	192
4.1	176	1.16	196
13.2	177	1.20	227
<i>epist. ad Smyrn.</i> 8.1	177	1.22	254
<i>epist. ad Trall.</i>		1.26	195
2.1–2	177	1.30	98, 267
2.3	148	1.31	125, 272
		1.32	269
		3.19	269

*alt. Luc. orth.*

11	110
14	114

*c. Helv.*

1	192
20	221
21	134
22	71

*c. Ioh.*

4	186
29	138

*c. Vig.*

1	223
3	109
16	132, 150

*comm. in Abac.*

2.3.7 ll. 410-411	225
2.3.7 ll. 410-415	171
2.3.10-13 ll. 893-895	246

*comm. in Abd.*

prol. ll. 31-32	71
prol. ll. 43-47	71
prol. ll. 780-781	71

*comm. in Agg.*

1.1 l. 16	221
1.11 l. 438	88
1.11 ll. 442-443	174
1.11 ll. 442-446	213
1.11 ll. 442-448	163
1.11 ll. 446-447	174, 175
1.11 ll. 448-450	154

*comm. in Am.*

1.2 ll. 124-125	105
2 prol. l. 1	109
2 prol. ll. 8-11	87
2 prol. ll. 10-11	103, 111
2 prol. l. 11	78
2 prol. ll. 26-27	114
2 prol. ll. 34-38	85
2.9-11 ll. 335-336	229
3 prol. ll. 55-56	114
4.1-3 l. 31	229
6.12-15 l. 477	246
8.4 l. 102	163
8.4-6 ll. 10-11	195, 202
8.4-6 ll. 102-111	127
8.4-6 ll. 103-104	185

*comm. in Dan.*

2.6.11 ll. 311-312	134
4.12.3 ll. 545-547	211

*comm. in Eccl.*

1.9-10	196
2.8 ll. 184-186	216
3.5 l. 87	221
3.6-7 ll. 124-126	111
3.16-17 ll. 258-259	226
3.18-21 ll. 347-348	210
3.18-21 l. 349	138
7.5 ll. 55-56	111
9.7-8 ll. 157-161	208
9.11 ll. 274-279	200
9.17 ll. 362-365	110, 111
9.17 ll. 362-366	190, 195
10.19 ll. 320, 329, 334	163

11.1 ll. 2-4	264
--------------	-----

*comm. in Eph.*

p. 474	209
p. 491	106
p. 507	149
p. 525	196
p. 563	254
p. 569	194, 197
p. 570	178

*comm. in Gal.*

1.1.11-12 ll. 42-43	185
1.2.9 ll. 79-80	212
1.2.11-13 ll. 77-78	109
2 prol. l. 44	227
2.4.1-2	68
3 prol. ll. 5-12	111, 192
3 prol. ll. 8-10	110
3 prol. l. 45	109
3 prol. ll. 53-54	201
3.5.18 ll. 141, 176	230
3.5.19-21 ll. 159-168	229
3.5.19-21 l. 160	61

*comm. in Hier.*

2.12 ll. 13-16	112
2.32 ll. 14-20	214
3.11 ll. 15-22	127
3.15 ll. 1-2	201
4 prol. ll. 10-12	273
4.45 ll. 10-12	113
23.11 l. 1	218

*comm. in Hiez.*

1.1 l. 250	230
1.3 l. 915	133
1.6-8 ll. 277-280	245
1.6-8 ll. 277-279	248
1.6-8 l. 301	246

*comm. in Hiez. (cont.)*

5 prol. ll. 12-15	114
6.13 ll. 511-512, 529	227
6.18 l. 311	230
7.23 l. 1197	133
8 prol. ll. 1-3	111
8 prol. ll. 15-16	206
8.27.23-24a l. 1315	122
9.29.17-21 ll. 692-693	194
9.29.17-21 ll. 952-953	122
11.34.1-31 ll. 257-263	192
11.34.1-31 ll. 259-262	196
11.34.1-31 ll. 260-261	111
11.39 ll. 2107-2108	117
12 prol. ll. 32-33	117
12.40 ll. 255-271	218
12.40 l. 1151	109
12.40.35-42 l. 986	168
12.41 l. 1344	88
13.44 ll. 1683-1685	229
13.44 ll. 1685-1686	228

*comm. in Ioel.*

3.7-8 ll. 170-171	247
-------------------	-----

*comm. in Ion.*

prol. ll. 6-7	59
prol. l. 7	61
2.7 ll. 247-248	232
3.6 l. 211	114

*comm. in Is.*

1 prol. ll. 100-103	111
1.6 l. 28	168
2.7 l. 10	230
2.9 l. 7	206
2.22 l. 40	91
3.2 ll. 26-27	190
3.4 ll. 41-43	139
3.12 l. 25	212
3.12 ll. 32-34	242
5.5 ll. 12-14	243
5.11-12 l. 8	228, 229
5.11-12 ll. 15-17	227
5.22 ll. 17-23	229
5.22 l. 20	228
6.1 ll. 15-18	197
6.2-3 ll. 18-19	246
6.9-10 l. 40	227
7.14 l. 29	78

7.14 ll. 58-61	103
9.14 l. 38	206
11.1-3 ll. 78-83	178
5 prol. ll. 47-51	114
13.2 l. 32	77
13.17 l. 9	219
14.23 l. 34	219
14.31-32 ll. 41-44	245
17.12-14 ll. 19-20	105
24.7-13 l. 25	228
24.7-13 ll. 25-26	229
24.7-13 ll. 38-41	214
24.7-13 l. 39	164
26.7-9 ll. 31-35	243
27.1 l. 61	230
28.5-8 l. 48	248
28.5-8 ll. 48-49	229
28.5-8 ll. 49-51	228
28.5-8 l. 50	229
29.13-14 ll. 34-37	95
46.3-7 ll. 46-49	95
49.8 l. 29	210
49.8-13 ll. 51-55	243
55.12-13 ll. 46-47	248
56.4-5 ll. 11-12	61
57.6 ll. 24-26	122
60.13 l. 33	113
60.13-14 l. 26	247
60.13-14 l. 32	91
62.1-3 ll. 49-50	248
63.2 l. 6	120
66.18-19 l. 36	230
66.20 ll. 72-74	243

*comm. in Mal.*

1.6-7 ll. 159-188	178
3.4 ll. 126-130	220
4.4 ll. 65-66	221

*comm. in Mich.*

2 prol. ll. 223-238	270
2.9-10 ll. 306-308	163
2.9-10 ll. 313-315	224
2.9-10 ll. 313-316	176
2.9-10 ll. 318-319	162
2.9-10 ll. 318-328	224
3.9-12 ll. 296-298	206

*comm. in Mt.*

6.24 l. 828	220
19.30 l. 978	92
21.10 l. 1280	201
21.13 l. 1341	163
23.5 ll. 92-96	244

*comm. in Naum*

2.8–9 l. 282	122
3.1–4 l. 78	168
3.1–4 ll. 110–113	248

*comm. in Os.*

1 prol. ll. 142–150	249
1 prol. ll. 149–150	134
1.2 ll. 122–126	98
2.6.1–3 l. 29	168
2.13 l. 285	210
2.16–17 ll. 428–431	114
3.12.9–10 ll. 229–230	246
10.13 ll. 441–444	114

*comm. in Soph.*

3.1–7 ll. 119–125	220
3.14–18 ll. 549–554	109
3.19–20 l. 598	219

*comm. in Tit.*

1.5b ll. 253–254	184
1.5b ll. 276–280	185
1.5b ll. 283–286	181, 184
1.6–7 ll. 300–303	174
1.6–7 ll. 308–311	261
1.6–7 ll. 400–401	182
1.6–7 l. 411	169
1.6–7 ll. 418–444	227
1.6–7 ll. 440–442	229
1.6–7 ll. 456–457	126
1.6–7 ll. 462–464	124
1.6–7 ll. 464–465	126
1.8–9 ll. 474–579	128
1.8–9 ll. 496–503	187
1.10–11 ll. 569–572	175
2.1 ll. 17–18	175
3.9 l. 181	106

*comm. in Zach.*

1 prol. l. 20	149
1.18–21 ll. 497–501	245
2.8 l. 78	68
2.8 ll. 169–170	247
3 prol. l. 10	227
3 prol. l. 24	133
8.6 ll. 160–168	213
10.6–7 ll. 169–171	246
11.3 l. 64	105
11.15–17 ll. 421–423	113

*dial. c. Pel.*

1.24	71, 209
1.30	196
2.24	163
3.5	71, 109

*epist.*

2.4	264
3.4.2	94, 138
3.4.4	105
3.5.2	264
6.2.1	69
10.1.1	138
10.2.1	108
10.2.2	74
10.3.3	68, 149
14	70, 71
14.1.1	70
14.3.2	139
14.6.1–2	132
14.8.1	132
16.1.1	108
18A.4.2	211
18A.6.4	107
18A.9.1	194
21.13.9	152
22	267–268
22.1.2	111
22.2.2	61, 267
22.2.3	267
22.6.6	110
22.8.1	229
22.8.3	230
22.10.2	138
22.12.2	137
22.14.1	156
22.16.2	176
22.16.3	141, 163
22.17.2	172
22.19.1	221
22.22.3	113
22.23.2–3	218
22.25.2	134
22.27.3	204
22.27.7	204
22.28.3	143, 163, 253
22.28.3–4	141
22.28.4	140
22.28.5	123, 166, 257
22.28.4–6	141
22.29.1	204
22.29.4	130, 133
22.30.3	68
22.30.5	76
22.31.1	122
22.32.1	206, 214
22.34.1	252
22.35.3	190

*epist. (cont.)*

22.36.3	122	49.17.2	254
22.40.3	210	49.18.3	61, 267
23.2.2	205	50.1.2	134, 249, 272
23.3.3	255	50.1.3	95, 197
24.1.2	117	50.3.1	144
24.3.1	65	50.3.2	141
24.3.2	204	50.4.1	132
24.4.3	132	50.5.1	134
24.5.1	92, 227	51.1.5	189
24.5.2	132, 205	53.1.1	149
27.1.2	210	53.2.1	76
27.1.3	163	53.3.2-3	174
27.2.1	272	53.3.3	211
27.2.2	268	53.3.6	211
27*.1	269	53.4.4	221
29.1.2	227	53.6.2	122
29.1.3	201	53.8.2	185
29.4.5	91	53.8.17	99
30.14.2	114	53.10.1	201
31	268	54.1.1	60
31.2.2	61, 267	54.5.1	147
33.3.1	163, 165	54.11.1	172
33.4.9	70	54.11.2	117, 139
36.14.1	110	54.12.1	164
36.14.2	227	54.12.2	253
36.15.4	78	54.13.1	185
38.2.2	227	54.13.2	141, 143, 177
38.3.1	204	54.13.5	154
38.4.3	204	54.14.2	74
39.1.3	205, 227	57.11.4	230
40.2.2	129, 130, 163	57.12.4	210
40.2.2-3	273	57.13.2	269
42.3.1	134	58.1.2	68
43	164	58.1.3	126
43.2.1	231	58.2.1	124, 176, 206
43.3.1	164	58.2.2	176, 206
44.1	149	58.4.1	108, 109
45.2.1	249	58.4.2	62, 132
45.2.2	259-260	58.5.1-2	132
45.3.1	180	58.6.1	130, 223
45.4.2	272	58.6.2	172207
45.5.1	163	58.6.3	204, 223, 262
46.1.2	267	58.7.1	214, 218
46.3.4	85	58.7.2	176
46.10.2	247	58.10.1	113
48.2.2	270	60.1.2	60, 100
48.4.3	114	60.5.3	76
48.18.2	68, 194	60.7.3	179
49.12.2	249	60.9.1	69, 139
49.13.3	201	60.9.2	61, 126
49.13.5	210	60.9.9	62
		60.10.1	115

60.10.2	205, 265	72.1.1	149
60.10.2-3	117	72.5.2	149
60.10.5	89, 128, 253, 257	75.3.1	201
60.10.6	209	75.4.2	269
60.10.7	134, 135, 246	77.1.1	69
60.10.8	195	77.2.2	115
60.10.9	114, 172	77.5.2	205
60.10.13	116	77.8.4	91
60.11.1	60, 118	77.9.1	247
60.11.2	61, 116, 117	77.9.2	70
60.11.3	95, 127, 131, 163, 207	78.2.3	62
		78.3.3	105
60.12.2	212	78.19.2	87
60.12.4	212	79.4.3	164
60.13.1	170	79.7.4	154
60.13.3	114	79.7.6	223
60.14.3	83, 170	79.7.7	204, 247
60.15.4	67	79.8.1	273
60.16.1	249	79.8.2	140
61.3.3	101	79.9.1	143
61.3.4	210	79.9.2	106, 172
64.20.3	245	79.2.4	175, 204
64.21.2	246	81.1.3	109
64.22.1	247	82.3.1	178
65.10.1	126	82.6.1	176, 269
66.1.2	247	82.6.2	129
66.2.2	246	82.8.1	67
66.3.1-2	245	82.11.4	117, 178
66.3.3	221	82.11.4-5	179
66.5.4	113	84.6.1	201
66.6.1	204	85.4.1	195
66.7.1	247	97.2.3	117
66.9.1	173	100.15.2	160
66.9.2	182	102.1.1	99
66.13.1	204	105.5.2	114
66.13.2	88	105.3.1	269
69.3.4	184	106.48.2	230
69.5.7	200	106.86.2	68
69.6.1	109, 246	107.4.1	68
69.8.2	271	107.4.7	147
69.8.4	174	107.9.2-3	148
69.8.7	163	107.10.1	91
69.9.1	229	107.10.3	246
69.9.2	124, 126, 133, 192, 196	107.11.1	141
69.9.2-3	163	107.12.2	172
69.9.3	224	107.12.3	113
69.9.4	215, 216	107.13.1	247
69.9.7	117	108.3.4	247
69.10.1	215	108.4.2	247
70.3.1	113	108.5.1	264
70.5.1	76	108.6.1	117
70.5.2	113	108.6.2	132

*epist. (cont.)*

108.6.3	139	123.13.1	81
108.13.1	124	123.15.2	170
108.14.2	212	123.17.2	154
108.15.3	92	123.17.3	61, 267
108.15.4	205	125.1.2	137
108.15.7	124, 218	125.5.1	272, 273
108.16.1	264	125.5.1-2	273
108.18.6	195	125.6.2	140
108.19.8	169	125.6.3	135, 204, 224
108.20.3	144	125.7.1	175, 176, 204
108.20.5	205	125.8.1	134
108.21.1	88	125.8.2	59, 61, 115, 172
108.24.2	225	125.9.1	141
108.25.2	87	125.9.2	134
108.25.4	272	125.9.3	126
108.30.2	265	125.12.1	69
108.33.1	61	125.15.2	91, 132, 178
108.33.3	139	125.16.1	127, 176
109.1.2	170	125.16.4	206
112.18.1	99	125.17.2	154
117	109, 136	125.18.1	173, 251, 252
117.1.2	269	125.19.1	250
117.1, 2-3	268	125.19.2-4	251
117.2.1	154	125.20.1	249
117.5.2	169	125.20.2	118
117.6.2	150, 204	125.20.4	217
117.6.3	200, 223	125.20.5	124, 127
117.7.2	204	126.1.3	118
117.7.3	149	127.2.2	198
117.8.2	149, 168	127.3.4	141
117.10.1	77	127.4.3	176, 206
118.1.3	110	128	146, 147
118.4.3	121	128.2.1	204, 205
119.1.1	117	128.3.5	146
119.9.4	210	128.4.2	172
119.10.1	206	128.4.5	149
120 prol. 2	269	128.5.1	214
120 prol. 4	118	129.3.8	76
120.1.12	124	130.6.1	201
120.9.1	210	130.7.2	127
120.12.4	112	130.7.12	125
120.12.10	206	130.13.2	101
121 prol. 2	78	130.14.3	223
121.6.13	220	130.14.7	213, 214
121.8.19	68	130.14.8	253
121.10.21	201	130.16.1	69
121.11.1	210	130.17.3	64
123.4.2	144	130.19.1	130, 143, 154
123.5.8	139	130.19.3	61, 267, 268
123.10.1	61, 117	130.19.4	273
123.12.2	221	130.19.5	113
		130.19.6	115

133.2.1	230	<i>v. Hilar.</i>	
133.11.2	210	2.6	265
133.11.6	272	10.13–14	265
133.13.3	175	10.14	208, 265
140.1.2	111, 114	13.10	219
145.1	124	20.3	132
146.1.1	140	<i>vir. ill.</i>	
146.2.2	184	prol.	76, 210
147.3.1	152	5	210
147.5.1	79, 201	57	195
147.7.1	150, 170	61	185
147.8.2	205	67	114
147.8.3	134	109	196
147.10.1	178	117	196, 197
<i>epist. ad Praes. 2</i>	227	125	196
<i>epist. adv. Ruf. 16</i>	152	128	196
<i>hebr. nom.</i> (ed. Lagarde)		129	191
p. 35	85	132	196
p. 40	104, 105	133	196
p. 50	228	135	59, 70, 71
p. 65	228		
p. 71	85	<i>John Cassian</i>	
<i>hom. de native. dom.</i> ll. 36–38		<i>coll.</i>	
	215	1.2	171, 205
<i>hom. de pers. Christ.</i> ll. 14–15		1.12	89
	122	2.13	73, 92, 93
<i>quaest. hebr. in Gen.</i> (ed. Lagarde)		3.1	132
p. 44	120	4.15	137
p. 57	206	4.20	126, 127, 132, 176,
<i>tract. in Marc.</i> 9 ll. 130–132			177
	186	4.21	126
<i>tract. in Ps.</i>		10.14	210
67 ll. 107–108	246	12.15.1	65
77 l. 152	194	14.4	89
78 ll. 29–30	210	14.7.2	61
78 ll. 29–31	114, 194	16.1	61
83 l. 27	220	16.5	64
86 ll. 119–121	194	16.8	85
89 ll. 65–66	170	17.13	61
90 ll. 117–120	77	18.2.1	61
93 ll. 40–41	252	18.16	169
96 ll. 2–3	77	19.8.2	61
106 ll. 131–132	88	20.1.1	61
106 l. 151	92	20.2.2	61
111 l. 37	91	24.13	206
127 ll. 62–64	194	<i>inst.</i>	
127 ll. 123–124	82	4.10	61
143 ii. 1–6	194	4.20	207
143 ll. 56–65	87	4.39	133
143 ll. 62–63	88	5.5	88
145 ll. 29–31	226	5.6	231
147 ll. 168–173	112	5.21	169



<i>inst. (cont.)</i>		36.1	81
5.38	90	38.2	132
6.4.2	92	38.4	171
7.9.1	61	39.1	198
7.24	160	40.4	169
10.22	90	49.5	171
11.3	205	49.6	93
11.18	135	50.3-4	214
12.15.1	64	51.5	143
		55.6	91
John Chrysostom		59.5	171
<i>ad Theod. laps.</i> 1.3	219	60.1	137
<i>adv. lud.</i> 7.6	187	67.5	170
<i>adv. oppug. v. mon.</i> p. 364		68.3	90, 134
	90	72.1	177
<i>c. lud. et theat.</i> 1	247	72.2	244
<i>hom. de eleem.</i> 6	264	72.6	204
<i>hom. de paen.</i> p. 278	162	77.4	207
<i>hom. in Act.</i>		77.5	88, 224
3.5	175, 254, 271	80.2	216
5.3	271	81.5	94
5.4	161	82.5	92
16.4	132	89.4	143
18.4-5	189	<i>hom. in Phil.</i>	
21.4	140	p. 226	160
30.4	134	p. 251	174
<i>hom. 3 in 1 Cor.</i> pp. 28-29		<i>hom. in 1 Tim.</i>	
	176	11.1	229
<i>hom. 4 in 1 Cor.</i> p. 38	176	11.3	184
<i>hom. 21 in 1 Cor.</i> p. 179	207	13.4	231
<i>hom. in Eph.</i>		<i>hom. in 2 Tim.</i> 5.4	256
10.3	213, 214	<i>quod nemo laed. nisi a se ipso</i> 6	
11.5	182		160
<i>hom. in Gen.</i> p. 226	187	<i>sacerd.</i>	
p. 472	187	2.6	105
p. 585	128	3.6	221
<i>hom. 7 in Hebr.</i>		3.10	216
p. 64	88, 137	3.11	130
p. 65	92	3.12	88
<i>hom. in Ign. mart.</i> 1	223	3.13	134
<i>hom. in Ioh.</i>		3.14	225, 254
52.4	160	3.15	173
64.3	160	3.16	128, 162, 253
<i>hom. 1 in Macc.</i> p. 619	86	4.1-2	126
<i>hom. in Mt.</i>		4.8-9	173
2.5	93	5.1	193
6.7	152	5.2	191
10.1	91	5.3	174
17.7	190	5.4	182
19.9	161	5.5	193
23.9	171	5.8	187
30.6	143	6.4	128, 224

6.5	88	Justin Martyr	
6.8	254, 257	<i>apol.</i> 67.3–4	142
<i>stat.</i> 3.7	187		
<i>virg.</i>		Juvenal	
9	88	<i>sat.</i>	
52	169	1.37–41	167
		1.102–105	163
John of Damascus		3.128–130	167
<i>sacr. par.</i> p. 188	92	4.18–19	167
		5.1–2	225
Josephus		6.71	80
<i>ant.</i> 18.64	257	6.548–550	167
		8.85–86	166
Julian of Eclanum		9.102	134
<i>tract. in Am.</i> 2.8	206	10.114	201
		10.198–202	168
Julian Pomerius		10.204–206	77
<i>v. cont.</i>		10.233–236	95
1.9.2	137	11.9–16	166
1.13.1	181	12.98–101	167
1.13.2	128, 176	12.98–130	169
1.15	174	13.242	133
1.17	175		
1.18	173	Juvencus	
1.20.1	174	<i>evang.</i> 1.121	82
1.21.1	128, 259	3.665	125
1.21.3	181		
1.23	190	Lactantius	
1.23–24	193	<i>div. inst.</i>	
1.24	201	3.8.8	61
1.25.1	89, 128, 162, 257	4.4.2	178
2.2.1	162, 212	4.6.6	85
2.2.2	216	4.24.7	61
2.4.2	141, 174, 176	5.8.4	214
2.4.3	161	5.13.8	200
2.10.1–2	123	6.7.5	64
2.10.2	124	7.12.12	93
2.11	124, 207, 262	<i>epit. div. inst.</i> 58.5	152
2.13.2	163	<i>op. dei</i> 1.5	125
2.14	123		
2.16.2	122	Leo the Great	
2.22.2	231	<i>epist.</i> 111.2	208
2.24.2	148, 176	<i>serm.</i>	
2.32.2	229	1.1	173
3.5	169	2.1–2	174
3.6.1	229		
3.6.5	255	Livy	
3.9.1	149	<i>a.u.c.</i>	
3.9.1–2	169	1.40.7	68
3.23.2	272	3.3.7	244
3.24.2	208	7.2.12	80
		10.8.5	101

<i>a.u.c. (cont.)</i>		6.63.1	169
29.37.17	244	6.63.5-6	208
30.45.6	244	6.63.7-8	169
34.11.7	200	7.66	170
39.37.19	200	8.27.1	167
42.30.4	244	8.27.1-2	169
42.41.2	101	9.9	170
45.35.5	101	9.48	170
		9.88.4	208
Lucan		10.8	167
<i>Phars.</i> 3.567	270	11.44.1	167
		11.55.3	169
Lucian		11.83.1	167
<i>dial. mort.</i>		12.40.5-6	169
6.2	167	12.56	169
15[5]	169	12.90	169
18[8]	169, 208	14.134	149
<i>macr.</i>			
18	98	Maximus of Turin	
19	98	<i>serm.</i>	
20	98	17	214
23	97	26	128
24	100		
26	99	Nilus of Ancyra	
Lucretius		<i>monast. exercit.</i> 55	160
<i>rer. nat.</i> 3.445-454	95	<i>orat. in Albian.</i> p. 709	124, 160
		<i>perist.</i> 12.1	169
Macrobius			
<i>Saturn.</i>		Novatian	
5.16.6-7	209	<i>cib. iud.</i> 6	227
6.1.35	209		
7.10.8	77	Origen	
Marius Victorinus		<i>c. Cels.</i> 3.61	256
<i>adv. Ar.</i> 2.5	82	<i>comm. in Mt.</i> 125	106
		<i>comm. in Ioh.</i> 1.29.203	179
Martial		<i>comm. in Rom.</i> 9.1	217
<i>epigr.</i>		<i>hom. in Ex.</i> 11.6	217
1.10	168	<i>hom. in Gen.</i> 6.3	218
2.26	169	<i>hom. in Ios.</i>	
2.26.1-2	168	3.5	107
2.32.6	167	15.3	107
2.40.3-4	208	<i>hom. in Lev.</i>	
2.65	170	5.8	177
4.56	167	6.3	216
4.56.3-6	208	8.10	106
5.18.7-8	208	10.1	218
5.39	170	<i>hom. in Num.</i> 19.1	103-104
5.39.5-6	169	<i>hom. 2 in Ps.</i> 37.2	250
6.27.9	167	<i>orat.</i> 22.1	179
6.63	170		
		Orosius	
		<i>c. Pel.</i> 24.2	85

Ovid		Paulinus of Milan	
<i>am.</i>		<i>v. Ambr.</i>	
1.4.25	151	35.1	62
1.4.33–34	150	41.1	126
1.12.29	83		
2.17.23	151	Paulinus of Nola	
3.8.40	165	<i>carm.</i>	
<i>ars. am.</i>		16.287–289	128
1.306	151	16.295–296	205
1.577–578	150	21.75	247
1.748	165	21.198	77
2.271–272, 329	167	24.631	230
2.329–332	168	25.49–53	143
<i>fast.</i>		<i>epist.</i>	
3.736	165	8.5	125
5.57–64, 69–74	115	13.13	217
6.415–416	88	13.28	247
<i>her.</i>		15.4	128
17.85–86	151	16.6	201
19.31	150	18	62
<i>met.</i>		19.4	128
4.117	150	23.7	128
11.787	200	25.1	62
13.533–534	88	25.8	126
<i>trist.</i>		34.7	218
2.223	151	39.6	92
3.7.34	74	40.11	64
		50.4	61
Palladius			
<i>dial.</i>		Pausanias	
12	207	<i>Gr. descr.</i> 1.18.8	97
16	73		
19	132	Pelagius	
<i>hist. Laus.</i>		<i>epist. ad Celant.</i>	
prol. 16	73	19.2	214
17.2	65	20.2	176
35.14	135		
44.1	62	Persius	
45.3	90	<i>sat.</i> 1.56–57	231
47.13–14	175		
54.1	264	Peter Chrysologus	
61.3–4	216	<i>serm.</i>	
68.1	62	29.1	160
		48.5	170
Patrick			
<i>conf.</i>		Petronius	
9	270	<i>sat.</i>	
47	188	27.3	168
48	272	53.13	80
		68.5	80
		117.9	169
		119 vv. 33–36	166
		139.4	151

Phaedrus		367	151
<i>fab.</i>		507–510	88
5.5.28	111	<i>Pseud.</i> 659	88
5.10.5	83	<i>Stich.</i> 740	151
		<i>Trin.</i> 244	151
		<i>Truc.</i> 528	151
Philo			
<i>somn.</i> 1.11	87		
<i>spec. leg.</i> 1.131, 156	121	Pliny the Elder	
<i>v. Mos.</i> 1.29	175	<i>nat. hist.</i>	
		9.168–169	166
Philostratus		9.169	166
<i>v. Apoll.</i> 8.29	74, 86	11.79	231
<i>v. soph.</i>		14.5	167
1.7	271	14.90	227
1.9	86	14.102	229
1.17.4	97	14.103	228
1.25	87	14.113–115	229
		14.148	182
Plato		14.149	229
<i>Crit.</i> 109c	246	24.1	134
<i>Lach.</i> 189c	95	32.60–63	166
<i>Phaed.</i> 84e–85a	100	32.62	166
<i>Phaedr.</i>		37.59	134
246a	246		
276d	95	Pliny the Younger	
<i>rep.</i> 329b	77	<i>epist.</i>	
<i>symp.</i> 195b	77	2.20	167
<i>Tim.</i> 69c	246	2.20.2–5	168
		4.15.3	167
Plautus		5.1.3	167
<i>Asin.</i> 13–14	152	7.24.8	252
<i>Bacch.</i>		8.23.7	99
18	150	9.30.2	208
212	252	10.96–97	257
1197	151	<i>pan.</i> 31.6	264
<i>Capt.</i> 77	225		
<i>Cas.</i> 897	156	Plutarch	
<i>Curc.</i> 164	151	<i>Brut.</i> 2	260
<i>Epid.</i> 666	102	<i>Cat.</i> 12	101
<i>Men.</i>		<i>moral.</i>	
106	166	497b–c	167
458	257	524a	160
756–758	86	525b	160
854	88	784a	92
<i>Merc.</i>		785a	99, 100
24–28	151	788e–f	77
314	102	789b	82
<i>Mil. glor.</i> 705–709	168	789d	87
<i>Most.</i> 325	151	796b	115
<i>Pers.</i> 58	225	837e–f	97
<i>Poen.</i>		838b	97
365–367	151		

Polycarp		Pseudo-Basil	
<i>epist. ad Php.</i>		<i>contub.</i> 6	144
6.1	126, 253		
11.1	126	Pseudo-Cyprian	
11.2	174	<i>sing. cler.</i>	
Pontius		4	223
<i>v. Cyp.</i>		7	174
6.3	205	17	147
15.5	225	28	141
		42	148
Possidius			
<i>v. Aug.</i>		Pseudo-Fructuosus of Braga	
3.2	95	<i>reg. mon.</i> 11	205
5.3	185		
5.5	186	Pseudo-Jerome	
9.1	174	<i>epist.</i> 42.2	141
22.1	205	<i>sept. ord. eccl.</i> 6	184, 187, 253
22.2	128		
22.6	128	Pseudo-Nilus	
23.2	123	<i>narr.</i> 2.1	77
24.15	217		
26.1	134	Pseudo-Paulinus of Nola	
26.1–3	136	<i>epist. app.</i> 2.17	130
27.1–2	253		
27.4	261	Pseudo-Phocylides	
27.5	257	<i>sent.</i> 70–75	169
Proba			
<i>cent.</i> 492	125	Pseudo-Quintilian	
		<i>decl. mai.</i> 15.10	68
Propertius			
<i>eleg.</i>		Pseudo-Tibullus	
2.14.29	151	<i>carm.</i> 3.11–12	151
4.3.29–30	150		
Prudentius		Quintilian	
<i>cath.</i> 10.141	83	<i>inst. orat.</i>	
<i>hamart. praef.</i> 58	230	2.5.12	143
<i>perist.</i>		2.5.22	110
2.104	206	2.13.8	125
10.433	230	4.1.77	109
<i>Psych.</i>		4.1.77–79	110, 111
600	206	4.3.1–2	65
911	247	5.7.7	182
		5.10.79	182
Pseudo-Athanasius		6.3.42	182
<i>virg.</i> 3–4	205	8 praef, 23–26	110
		8.5.3	182
Pseudo-Augustine		8.5.11, 13–14	110
<i>sobr. et cast.</i> 2	133	9.2.36	216
		10.1.86	182
		10.1.118	182
		10.1.139	201
		11.1.36	101

<i>inst. orat. (cont.)</i>		12.5	223
11.1.45	244	12.8	79
12.1.22	201	<i>cons. ad Helv.</i> 10.11	160
12.10.64	102	<i>cons. ad Marc.</i> 19.2	167
12.10.73	109, 110, 111	<i>epist.</i>	
12.11.3	182	8.3	208
12.11.23	101	15.3	231
Rufinus		19.4	167
<i>apol. c. Hier.</i>		29.12	111
2.5	61, 267,	52.8	177
	268	58.35	252
2.6	61, 267	75.4	175
2.7	196	87.9	101
2.13	61, 267	94.43	160
2.43	268	102.7	252
<i>bened. patr.</i> 2.25	85	<i>Herc. fur.</i> 849–850	88
<i>hist. eccl.</i>		<i>provid.</i> 2.5	162
5.18.5	252	<i>tranqu. anim.</i>	
10.12	252	1.6	166
		1.7	128
Sallust		Sidonius Apollinaris	
<i>bell. Jug.</i> 14.24	73	<i>epist.</i>	
Salvian		1.2.3	230
<i>ad eccl.</i>		8.2.2	201
1.1.1	160	Silius Italicus	
3.18.80	175	<i>Pun.</i>	
<i>gub. dei</i>		1.218	85
1.2.10	206	1.253	270
3.3.15	62	5.570	77
3.9.43	255	16.575	111
		17.322	270
Seneca the Elder		Siricius	
<i>controv.</i> 1 praef. 2–5	95	<i>epist.</i>	
Seneca the Younger		1.9.13	142
<i>ben.</i>		1.13.17	9–10
1.10.4–5	260	6.1.3	126
1.14.3	167	Socrates	
2.24.2	260	<i>hist. eccl.</i>	
2.24.2–4	260	1.5.8	197
2.31.1	260	6.4.5–6	257
2.32.4	260	Sozomen	
2.33.1–2	260	<i>hist. eccl.</i>	
2.35.1	260	1.12.10	88
3.1.1	260	4.20	62
4.20.3	168	4.25.3–3	217
6.38.4	167, 169	4.27	62
7.13.1	91	6.9	62
<i>brev. vit.</i>			
7.10	73		

Statius		<i>Phorm.</i> 214	200
<i>silv.</i> praef. 2	117		
4.6.8–11	163	Tertullian	
4.7.33–40	167	<i>apol.</i>	
<i>Theb.</i> 10.133	125	6	227
		11	101
Suetonius		47	64
<i>Ner.</i> 16.2	257	<i>cult. fem.</i>	
		1.7	166
Sulpicius Severus		2.10	166
<i>dial.</i> 1.8.4	61, 267	2.13	176
<i>v. Mart.</i> prol.		<i>ieiun.</i> 6	231
1	270	<i>pall.</i> 5	168
20.2	257–258	<i>pat.</i> 5	138
24.7	273	<i>praescr. haer.</i>	
27.4	273	16	252
		41	142
Synesius of Cyrene			
<i>epist.</i>		Themistius	
5	126	<i>orat.</i> 32.360d	162
49	142		
57	209	Theodoret	
67	62	<i>interpr. in Ps.</i> p. 1824	92
		<i>epist.</i> 28	93
Tacitus		<i>hist. rel.</i>	
<i>Agr.</i> 15.2	134	prol. 5	88
<i>ann.</i>		1.7	88
3.66.1	101	3.17	73
3.66.4	94	4.12	89
12.6.1	94	5.8	154
13.52	167	8.13	136
14.15.3	94	10.1	170
15.44.3–4	257	10.2	88
<i>dial.</i>		17.1	154
6.2	167	17.2	89
39.4	111	17.5	160
<i>Germ.</i> 20.5	167	17.7	128
<i>hist.</i> 3.83.1	111	17.8	175
		23.2	86
Terence		24.1	86, 89
<i>Ad.</i> 17–19	271	24.9	265
<i>Andr.</i>		26.23	89
16	270		
18–19	271	Theognis	
20–21	271	<i>eleg.</i>	
22–23	270	227–232	160
<i>Eun.</i>		596	160
18	270		
265	225	Thucydides	
313–317	149	<i>hist.</i> 3.96.1	99
578–580	144		
579	147		
856–858	147		



Tibullus		Virgil	
<i>carm.</i>		<i>Aen.</i>	
1.3.45	165	1.432	165
1.3.72	225	5.395–396	77
1.4.24	151	6.816	244
1.10.13–14	73	7.417	74
		10.628–630	73
Valerius Maximus		12.536	270
<i>mem.</i>		<i>ecl.</i>	
5.8.3	252	3.89	165
8.7 ext. 3	97	6.2	101
8.7 ext. 9	97	8.63	209
8.7 ext. 11	98	9.51, 53	75
8.7 ext. 13	99	<i>georg.</i>	
Varro		2.483–484	74
<i>ling. lat.</i>		2.484	74
7.3.29	80	3.51–53	74
7.5.84	80	4.35	165
		4.457–459	68
Victor of Vita		Zeno of Verona	
<i>hist. pers.</i> 1.26		83	
		<i>tract.</i>	
Vincent of Lérins		1.1.4	154
<i>common.</i> 1.2		1.1.5	77
132			

## INDEX OF LATIN WORDS

- accepisse*, 263  
*adsistere*, 138  
*adulescens*, 65  
*amor*, 150  
*apostolus*, 112  
*apud*, 225  
*audientes*, 111  
*auriscalpius* [*matronarum*], 157  
  
*beatus*, 113, 116  
*bellicosus*, 77  
  
*carissime*, 61, 267  
*chameunia*, 88  
*Christiani*, 257  
*cibarius* [*panis*], 164  
*clamor*, 111  
*clericatus*, 125–126, 141  
*clericus*, 63–64, 120, 127, 128, 153, 181, 182, 226  
*clerus*, 63–64, 121, 185  
*cogere*, 200, 267  
*commodius habere*, 169  
*conc(h)a*, 165–166  
*consolari*, 188  
*contionator*, 202  
  
*David*, 82, 221  
*decrepitus*, 102  
*desertum*, 70–71  
*desiderium*, 151  
*detractor*, 252  
*dicere*, 189  
*discursus*, 88  
*dispensator*, 208  
*diverticulum*, 64  
*divina lectio*, 106, 172  
*domus*, 164  
*dormire* [*cum*], 78–79  
*dum*, 68–69  
  
*ele(e)mosyna*, 90  
*eleganter*, 198  
*episcopus*, 162, 181, 184, 187, 209  
*erubescere*, 101  
*eruditus*, 194–195  
  
*et*, 62  
*ethnicus*, 76  
*excubare*, 224  
  
*fasciola*, 149  
*fermentum*, 228  
*fertur*, 96  
*fideicommissa*, 161  
*flosculus*, 110  
*fortitudo*, 245, 248  
*frater*, 139  
*furtum*, 263  
  
*garrulus*, 192  
*gentilis*, 76  
*germana*, 138–139  
  
*habitus*, 144  
*(h)eremus*, 68, 70–71  
*honores*, 223  
*hospitium*, 127–128, 134  
  
*images*, 223  
*immo*, 65, 67, 172  
*ineptia*, 151  
*infames*, 159  
*inhumana*, 148  
*inopes*, 129  
*inquit*, 178, 250  
*interpretari*, 104  
*inverbis*, 67  
*invitus*, 200  
*iustitia*, 245, 248  
  
*labor*, 90  
*liber*, 71, 267  
*libellus*, 61, 117, 267  
*lippitudo*, 134  
*litterulae*, 150  
*loqui*, 185  
*ludere*, 71  
*lumen*, 151  
*lux*, 151  
  
*mammona*, 220  
*marsuppium*, 206

- matula*, 168  
*mel*, 151  
*mella*, 165  
*mensula*, 127–128  
*meretrix*, 106  
*militia*, 61–62, 126  
*mimus*, 79  
*minister Christi*, 215  
*ministerium*, 170  
*monachus*, 63, 153  
*munuscula*, 149  
*mysteria*, 194–195  
  
*natio*, 76  
*natus*, 77  
*nec*, 91  
*nudus*, 124  
*nunc*, 72–73, 165  
*nutrix*, 147  
  
*o*, 170  
*officium*, 125–126  
*opus*, 71  
*oratio*, 90  
*ostentui habere*, 244  
  
*paganus*, 76  
*pauper*, 89, 225  
*periclitari*, 169  
*peritus*, 194–195  
*perlitteratus*, 203  
*phylacteria*, 244  
*plausus*, 111  
*plebicula*, 201  
*pontifex*, 116–117, 177, 178, 209  
*presbyter*, 181  
*principium*, 108  
*propositum*, 153  
*proprius*, 163  
*prudentia*, 245, 248  
*psaltes*, 143  
*puer*, 65  
*puerilis*, 109  
*pulchre*, 230  
*purulentia*, 168  
  
*qualiacumque*, 117  
*quasi*, 182, 187  
*qui*, 206–207  
*quod*, 76, 172  
  
*rabula*, 192  
*redolere*, 227  
*repetere*, 108  
*rusticitas*, 210  
*rusticus*, 210  
  
*sacerdos*, 180–181, 185, 188, 224–225  
*sacerdotium*, 153, 181  
*sacramentum*, 76–77, 103, 106, 194–195  
*saeculares*, 223  
*saeculum*, 152–153  
*sanctus*, 69  
*sapientia*, 245  
*sapientissimus*, 85  
*scitum est*, 182  
*scortum*, 106  
*secundoprimum*, 198  
*sed*, 102  
*sensiculus*, 110  
*sermo*, 191  
*sicera*, 228  
*simplex*, 210  
*soror*, 139  
*stemmata*, 223  
*subauditur*, 250  
*suculentus*, 230  
*sudarium*, 206  
*supellectilis*, 122  
  
*temperantia*, 245, 248  
*trames*, 64  
*tugurium*, 164  
  
*usurpare* [*scientiam*], 196  
  
*vel*, 62–63, 121  
*velle*, 263–264  
*verba volvere*, 195  
*vetulus*, 102  
*vivax*, 170  
*volumen*, 61, 76

## INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

ἅγιος, 69  
ἀνδρεία, 245

δευτεροπρώτος, 198  
διάκονος, 215  
δικαιοσύνη, 245

ἐλεημοσύνη, 90  
ἐπίσκοπος, 162  
ἐπιφώνημα, 110  
ἐρῆμος, 68

ἡθοποιία, 163, 264

κληρικός, 63  
κλήρος, 63–64, 120–121

λειτουργός, 215  
λόγος, 191

μαρσύππιον, 206  
μειρακιώδης, 109

μίμος, 79  
μοναχός, 63  
μυστήριον, 77

πάνσοφος, 85  
παραινετικός, 4, 70  
πένης, 89  
πτωχός, 89

σίκερα, 228  
σοφία, 245  
σωφώτατος, 85  
σωφοσύνη, 245

ὕπηρέτης, 215

φρόνησις, 245

χαμευνία, 88  
Χριστιανοί, 257

ψάλτης, 143

## INDEX OF HEBREW AND ARAMAIC WORDS

אבישג, 104

אמן, 220

חמת, 107

ממונא, 219

פרץ, 106

שכר, 228